

THE USE OF THE
OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS
IN CLEMENT OF ROME

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL BOARD

President: W. C. VAN UNNIK, Bilthoven (Utr.) Netherlands

P. BRATSIOTIS – K. W. CLARK – H. CLAVIER – J. W. DOEVE – J. DORESSE

C. W. DUGMORE – J. DUPONT – A. GEYSER – W. GROSSOUW

A. F. J. KLIJN – PH. H. MENOUD – BO REICKE – K. H. RENGSTORF
E. STAUFFER

VOLUME XXXIV



LEIDEN
E.J. BRILL

1973

THE USE OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS IN CLEMENT OF ROME

BY

DONALD ALFRED HAGNER



LEIDEN
E.J. BRILL
1973

ISBN 90 04 03636 9

Copyright 1973 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN BELGIUM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	IX
Abbreviations	XII
Introduction	I
A. The Epistle	1
B. The Text of the Epistle	8
C. Purpose and Scope of Present Work	13

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN CLEMENT'S EPISTLE

I. Quotation of the Old Testament in Clement, the New Testament, and the Apostolic Fathers	21
A. Frequency of Citation	21
B. The Use of Introductory Formulae	26
C. Exactness of Citation	33
II. The Relation of Clement's text to the Septuagint	37
A. Septuagintal Quotations	38
1. Essentially Verbatim Quotations	38
2. Moderately Variant Quotations	51
B. Composite Quotations	55
1. From the Same Book	55
2. From Different Books	59
C. Non-Septuagintal Quotations	64
D. Non-Canonical Quotations	68
1. Apocrypha	68
2. Unknown Writings	69
III. Possible Explanations of Variant Quotations	80
A. Differing Greek Translations	80
B. Unknown Writings	86
C. Anthologies	93
D. Memory	103
IV. Clement's View of the Old Testament	109
A. Inspiration	109
B. Canon	111
C. Interpretation	120

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN CLEMENT'S EPISTLE

V. Clement's Knowledge of Synoptic Material	135
A. Quotations from the Synoptic Tradition	135
1. Clement 13.2	135
2. Clement 46.8	153
B. Allusions to the Synoptic Tradition	164
C. Old Testament Citations Found Also in the Synoptics	171
VI. Clement's Use of Hebrews and the Pauline Epistles	179
A. The Epistle to the Hebrews	179
B. Paul to the Corinthians	195
C. Romans	214
D. The Remaining Pauline Epistles	220
1. Galatians	221
2. Ephesians	222
3. Philippians	226
4. Colossians	229
5. The Pastoral Epistles	230
VII. Clement's Knowledge of Other New Testament Writings	238
A. 1 Peter	239
B. James	248
C. Acts	256
D. The Johannine Literature	263
1. The Fourth Gospel	264
2. The First Epistle	268
3. The Apocalypse	270
VIII. Clement, the Apostolic Fathers, and the New Testament	272
A. The Use of Introductory Formulae	272
B. Allusion and Quotation	277
1. The Synoptic Gospels	278
2. The Pauline Epistles	283
3. Remaining Writings	286
C. Explanations of the Free Character of Allusions and Quotations	287
1. Differing Canonical Text	288
2. Memory	290
3. Extra-canonical Written Sources	293
4. Oral Tradition	303

IX. Clement's View of the New Testament Writings . . .	313
A. Pre-canonical Collections	313
1. The Pauline Corpus	314
2. The Gospels	332
3. Other Writings	335
B. Authority and Inspiration	337
C. Interpretation	348
Appendixes	351
Selected Bibliography	356
Author Index	370
Index of References	375

PREFACE

The use of the Old Testament in the New Testament is a subject that has been studied rather thoroughly in recent times. Quotation in the Apostolic Fathers, on the other hand, has remained a comparatively neglected field of study, despite the interesting questions associated with it. Shortly after my arrival in Manchester in the autumn of 1966, when I was casting about for a suitable topic of research leading to the Ph. D., my friend Dr. Julius Scott suggested that a study of quotation in Clement of Rome might be worthwhile and interesting. Following up this suggestion, for which I remain grateful, I found myself increasingly fascinated with the subject of quotation in the Apostolic Fathers and specially in Clement of Rome. The abundance of quotations and allusions in 1 Clement together with its early date, make this epistle particularly significant for the study of text, canon, and interpretation—not only so far as the use of the Old Testament is concerned, but also concerning the early use of the New Testament writings.

This book is virtually identical with the thesis as accepted by the University of Manchester in late summer of 1969; only the slightest revision has been undertaken. I should like to express my special gratitude to Professor F. F. Bruce, under whose supervision I worked, and who offered many valuable suggestions in the course of my research. Thanks are also due to Dr. R. A. Kraft, of the University of Pennsylvania, who took time from a busy schedule to correspond with me on a number of matters pertinent to the subject.

I am particularly grateful to the Librarian and Staff of the John Rylands Library, Manchester, for making the resources of the Library available to me and for gladly accommodating me. I should also like to thank the Librarians and Staffs of the Libraries of the University of Manchester, the University of Cambridge, and Tyndale House, Cambridge, for the kind use of their facilities.

I am grateful to the publishers for undertaking a difficult work, and also to the G. W. Aldeen Fund of Wheaton College and my friend Edwin A. Turner, Jr., M. D., for financial help in underwriting a portion of the cost of publication.

Finally, I express my thanks to my wife, Beverly, who typed the work with loving care and infinite patience, and who was a continual source of encouragement to me during the time of research and writing.

Wheaton College,
Wheaton, Illinois.

DONALD A. HAGNER.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AF</i>	<i>The Apostolic Fathers</i> (6 vols.), ed. R. M. Grant
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i> (Manchester)
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CGT</i>	Cambridge Greek Testament
<i>CHB</i>	<i>Cambridge History of the Bible</i> (3 vols.)
<i>CSEL</i>	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
<i>GCSE</i>	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
<i>GNTK</i>	<i>Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons</i> (2 vols.), by T. Zahn
<i>HDB</i>	<i>Dictionary of the Bible</i> (5 vols.), ed. J. Hastings
<i>HE</i>	<i>Ecclesiastical History</i> (Eusebius)
Hennecke-Schneemelcher	<i>New Testament Apocrypha</i> (2 vols.), trans. R. McL. Wilson
<i>HJ</i>	<i>Hibbert Journal</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HZNT</i>	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. H. Lietzmann
<i>ICC</i>	International Critical Commentary
<i>IDB</i>	<i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> (4 vols.), ed. G. A. Buttrick
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LCC</i>	Library of Christian Classics
<i>LCL</i>	Loeb Classical Library
Lightfoot	<i>The Apostolic Fathers</i> (2 parts in 5 vols.)
<i>MS(S)</i>	Manuscript(s)
<i>MT</i>	Massoretic Text
<i>Nov. Test.</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTAF</i>	<i>The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers</i> by a Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus</i> . Series Graeca (162 vols.) ed. J.-P. Migne
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RGG</i>	<i>Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> , 3rd. ed. (7 vols.), ed. K. Galling
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , ed. G. Kittel, trans. G. W. Bromiley
<i>ThZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>TS</i>	Texts and Studies (Cambridge)
<i>TU</i>	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZKG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
<i>ZNTW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

INTRODUCTION

A. THE EPISTLE

The epistle commonly known as “The First Epistle of Clement” holds a prominent position in the history of early Christian literature since, being written about 95-96 AD, it is the earliest extant Christian writing which is not a part of our New Testament canon. Other writings usually included among the Apostolic Fathers may contain some earlier materials, e.g. Barnabas and the Didache, but in the form in which we know these writings, Clement stands at the head, the first of the Apostolic Fathers, the first “Doctor” of the Church.¹

Although traditionally the epistle has been called “First Clement”, it is not written in Clement’s name but, as the salutation indicates, in the name of “the Church of God which sojourns in Rome”. Indeed, the name of Clement does not occur in the whole of the epistle, although most of the MSS include a colophon attributing the epistle to Clement of Rome.² The tradition, however, which associates Clement’s name with the epistle is an early one, beginning about 170 AD with Hegesippus and Dionysius of Corinth (respectively recorded in Eusebius *HE* IV, 22, 1 and IV, 23, 11), and slightly later with Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* III, 3, 3).³ Even earlier, a reference in Hermas (*Vis.* II, 4, 3) indicates that a certain Clement was entrusted with the publication of epistles from Rome. It is possible that the Clement here named is the same Clement associated with our epistle, but this remains far from certain owing to the difficulty of dating Hermas.⁴ Since, however, our epistle was written by someone on behalf of the Roman Church, and since

¹ The latter is Lightfoot’s famous title given to Clement. See I, 1, 103.

² The one exception is the colophon of the Coptic (Berlin papyrus) MS which, like the epistle’s salutation, reads simply “The Epistle of the Romans to the Corinthians”.

³ The first clear reference to Clement as the *author* of the epistle comes from Clement of Alexandria c. 200 AD. (*Stromata* I, 38, 8; IV, 111, 1; VI, 65, 3). A complete catalogue of references to Clement in the literature of the Church down to the tenth century can be found in Lightfoot I, 1, 148-200. Cf. A. Harnack, *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, I/1 (Leipzig, 1893), pp. 39-47.

⁴ Even with a later dating (e.g. 150 AD) of Hermas, however, the reference may be a “literary device based on knowledge of the earlier book”. Thus K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, LCL (London, 1912), I, 4.

tradition unanimously attaches the name Clement to the epistle, there is no reason for not continuing to refer to the epistle as Clement's.

On the other hand, there is reason to reject the adjective "first" in referring to the epistle since it implies that our author is also the author of 2 Clement, which he is not. The latter "epistle"—really a homily—is the first of a large number of writings which early came to be associated with Clement's name. Probably the most famous of these pseudepigrapha were the *Pseudo-Clementines*, i.e. the *Clementine Recognitions* and the *Clementine Homilies*, which contain a legendary tale concerning Clement's family history apparently derived from the same original source (second or third century).¹ Two *Epistles of Virginity* (probably from the third century), which survive only in Syriac translation, are written under Clement's name, and in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (fourth century) Clement is said to have been the intermediary of the decree of the Apostles to the Church.² Finally, five Latin letters (the first, called the "Epistle of Clement to James", was derived from the *Homilies*) attributed to Clement composed a basic part of the infamous ninth century *False Decretals*.³ With all of this literature the present work has little to do, and so far as the epistle called "2 Clement" is concerned, although its earlier date and inclusion among the Apostolic Fathers make it much more relevant for the task before us, we classify it with the pseudepigrapha as having no connection with the genuine epistle. In the following pages we shall accordingly speak of the genuine epistle simply as "Clement", or "the epistle of Clement". On a few occasions, especially when 2 Clement enters into our considerations, the expression "1 Clement" is used to avoid confusion.

Almost nothing is known about Clement of Rome, the alleged author of our epistle. In the list given by Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* III, 3, 3), reflecting what seems to be the traditional order (cf. Eusebius, *HE* III, 21; Jerome, *de Vir. Ill.* 15), Clement appears third in the succession of Roman bishops, following—after Peter—Linus and Anacletus (or

¹ A summary of this entertaining story is available in Lightfoot I, 1, 14-16. Useful information about the *Pseudo-Clementines* can be found in F. J. A. Hort, *Notes Introductory to the Study of the Clementine Recognitions* (London, 1901); cf. also Harnack, *Geschichte der Alichristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* II/2, [= *Die Chronologie* ii] (Leipzig, 1904), pp. 518-540.

² This work was published as late as the sixteenth century under Clement's name and Book VIII contains a tradition commonly designated the "Clementine Liturgy".

³ On the literature attributed to Clement, see Lightfoot's excursus "The Letters Ascribed to S. Clement", I, 1, 406-420; cf. I, 1, 100-103.

Cletus).¹ According to traditional chronography (e.g. Eusebius, *HE* III, 15; III, 34), Clement led the Roman Church as bishop during almost the whole of the last decade of the first century. The growth of such a large literary tradition associated with Clement's name may indicate that he was a well-known figure during his own lifetime. That he was a leading figure of the Roman Church cannot be doubted. He was not, however, a "bishop" in the later sense of the word, since a monarchical episcopacy had not yet evolved—in Rome, at any rate. He was a "presbyter-bishop" (the words are used interchangeably in the epistle), not essentially different from other presbyter-bishops in the early Church, as the conspicuous absence of personal reference in the epistle, together with its conciliatory language, indicates.

Irenaeus alleges that Clement was a disciple of the Apostles Peter and Paul (*Comm. in Joann.* 6,36); Tertullian writes (with the *Pseudo-Clementines*) that Clement was consecrated by Peter himself.² Probably these and similar claims are based more on legend than truth, although it is possible that Clement had become acquainted with Peter and Paul on their visits to Rome.³ Similarly, the suggestion that our Clement is the same as the Clement mentioned by Paul in Phil. 4.3 (thus Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome) is quite improbable, if only because of the lapse of time and the fact that the name Clement was a common one in the first century. A fourth-century Greek *Martyrium S. Clementis* is to be regarded as legendary, and the later tradition of Clement's martyrdom rests on no historical foundations.

Some have maintained that our Clement is none other than the consul Titus Flavius Clemens, cousin of Domitian, who was martyred for "atheism" (c. 95) and the practice of Jewish customs (Dio Cassius 67, 14). Clemens and his wife Domitilla were in all probability Christians. No evidence exists, however, which would justify the identification

¹ The Liberian list of AD 354 puts Clement immediately after Linus and preceding Cletus and Anacletus, who are taken as separate individuals. The subject is very thoroughly discussed in Lightfoot's chapter "Early Roman Succession", I, 1, 201-345. Cf. Harnack, *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* II/1, [= *Die Chronologie* i] pp. 70-230. See also A. Ehrhardt, "The Early Succession Lists", *The Apostolic Succession* (London, 1953), pp. 35-61. For Clement's own view of apostolic succession, see *ibid.*, p. 76ff.

² This is maintained by Epiphanius, who argues—quite improbably—that Clement relinquished his rightful office to Linus and Anacletus (*Haer.* 27, 6).

³ Thus Lightfoot, who suggests that this explains the expression τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀποστόλους of 5.3. I, 1, 73.

of the consul Clemens with the Clement of the Roman Church. No ancient authority indicates an awareness of this identity. The closest to it that can be found is the contention of the fictional *Pseudo-Clementines* that Clement was the son of Faustus, a foster brother of the Roman emperor. Much more justifiable is the conjecture of Lightfoot that Clement was "a freedman or the son of a freedman belonging to the household of Flavius Clemens",¹ but although Lightfoot presents an attractive argument, its truth cannot finally be determined.

The date of Clement's epistle is, as has been indicated above, almost certainly to be placed at 95 or 96 AD. This date, which has commonly been held since the *editio princeps* of Patrick Young in 1633, rests on a number of converging strands of evidence. External evidence suggests a date towards the end of the first century. As we have already seen, there is a considerable amount of evidence which associates the epistle with the name of Clement, who according to the earliest lists served as bishop of Rome during the last decade of the first century. Thus Eusebius, for example, writes that Clement was bishop of Rome from the twelfth year of Domitian to the third year of Trajan, a period of nine years, 92-101 AD (*HE* III, 15; III, 34).² Additional external evidence is found in the possible allusion to Clement's epistle by Ignatius who, writing to the Romans, recalls "you taught others" (*Rom.* 3.1), and in the certain use of Clement's epistle by Polycarp in his epistle to the Philippians.³

The external evidence is confirmed by the evidence which can be drawn from the epistle itself. Perhaps the most important time indicator in the epistle is found at the very beginning where Clement notes that the letter has been slow in coming to the Corinthians, "owing to the sudden and repeated misfortunes and calamities which have befallen us" (1.1). These words evidently refer to a great trial brought upon the Church, not improbably in the form of Imperial persecution.⁴

¹ I, 1, 61. Lightfoot gives us the most informed discussion available on the relationship between Clement and the Imperial family. See I, 1, 14-63.

² On the chronology of the various episcopal lists see Lightfoot, I, 1, 339-343.

³ Lightfoot gives a list of the parallels which point to literary dependence. I, 1, 149-152.

⁴ R. L. P. Milburn, however, has argued that the troubles referred to by Clement were internal problems within the Roman Church. "The Persecution of Domitian", *Church Quarterly Review* 139 (1945), 154-164. A refutation of this viewpoint may be found in L. W. Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background* (Oxford, 1966), p. 9ff.

Since it is known that Domitian was responsible for liquidating many individuals on the charge of "atheism" or following "Jewish practices", Clement's opening words quite probably refer to the violence wreaked upon the Church in the final years of Domitian's reign, and the epistle is therefore probably to be dated just after the latter's assassination.¹ While some have alleged that the persecution alluded to is that of Nero, and that the epistle is therefore to be dated about 70 AD,² the reference to the martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul in chapter 5 leaves the decided impression that these events happened not in the immediate past, but a number of years ago although still within "our own generation" (5.1). Furthermore, the messengers who deliver Clement's letter to the Corinthians are said to have lived blamelessly "among us" (i.e. the Church) "from youth to old age" (63.3) which implies a longer period than possible between the founding of the Roman Church and the year 70. Similarly, in 47.6 the Church at Corinth is referred to as the "ancient [*ἀρχαία*] Church of the Corinthians", a designation which seems less appropriate in the year 70 than in the year 95. More important than these indicators is the evidence of chapters 42-44, where the Apostles are clearly far enough in the past to have appointed men as bishops who upon their death had been duly succeeded by their own appointees (44.3,5).

At the same time, some of the internal evidence seems to prohibit a later dating of the epistle, say at the beginning of Hadrian's reign, following the persecution of Trajan. For it is then unlikely that our author could say that Peter and Paul were of "our generation", and it is very improbable that any presbyters appointed by the Apostles would have still been alive as they are stated to be in 44.3. Moreover, at the time the epistle was written the terms presbyter and bishop were still interchangeable, a situation which began to change early in the second century.

Enough has been said concerning the dating of the epistle to indicate that the evidence is almost overwhelming in its support of the tra-

¹ Barnard fully discusses the subject in his chapter on "St. Clement of Rome and the Persecution of Domitian", *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background*, pp. 5-18. He points out that Domitian's persecution was not *en masse*, but rather aimed at leading members of society—many of whom had become Christians—and for that reason all the more sinister.

² See Edmundson, *The Church of Rome in the First Century* (London, 1913), pp. 188-205. Cf. L. E. Elliot-Binns, *The Beginnings of Western Christendom* (London, 1948), p. 101f.

ditional date of the middle nineties of the first century.¹ It may only be added that there is nothing in the content of the epistle or in its use of the NT writings which points convincingly to anything other than the traditional date.

Clement wrote his epistle on behalf of the Roman Church to the Church at Corinth for the purpose of exhorting the brethren there to avoid the strife, party spirit, and sedition which had lately come to plague their church, causing its name (1.1) as well as the name of the Lord (47.7) to be blasphemed and causing many to stumble (46.9). Clement's epistle is parallel to the first epistle written by Paul to the Church at Corinth some forty years earlier which also rebuked the Corinthians of contention and party spirit (1 Cor. 1.10ff; 3.3ff.). The same kind of dissension, rivalry, and jealousy had again flared up at Corinth. The exact details of the situation at Corinth cannot be determined, but it seems to have involved personal rather than doctrinal matters. Clement's concern throughout the epistle is with proper conduct, and not with correct doctrine. It is clear, however, that certain rightful leaders of the Church had been unjustly deposed (44.6; 47.6), through the leadership of a few (cf. 47.6) proud, self-willed individuals who were apparently able to capitalize on the jealousy and ambition of others whom they led.

Whatever may have been the exact causes of the Corinthian turmoil, Clement leaves no doubt as to its remedy : humility must replace pride ; party spirit must give way to unity ; strife must yield to peace ; and jealousy be conquered by love. No better summary of the epistle can be given than that provided by Clement himself at the end of his epistle :

We have now written to you, brethren, sufficiently touching the things which befit our worship, and are most helpful for a virtuous life to those who wish to guide their steps in piety and righteousness. For we have touched on every aspect of faith and repentance and true love and self-control and sobriety and patience, and reminded you that you are bound to please almighty God with holiness in righteousness and truth and long-suffering, and to live in concord, bearing no malice, in love and peace with eager gentleness, even as our fathers, whose example we quoted, were well-pleasing in their humility towards God, the Father and Creator, and towards all men. (62.1f., Lake's translation)

It is evident from this summary alone that Clement's concern is exclusively a practical one, and that the epistle may be fairly summed

¹ Full discussion of the dating of the epistle is available in Lightfoot I, 1, 346-358.

up as an extended piece of ethical paraenesis. So urgent does Clement regard the problem concerning which he writes, that it dominates the epistle from beginning to end.¹ Clement allows himself few digressions from the main theme of the epistle, and everything within the epistle is calculated to have its effect upon the dissident Corinthians. Because of the special purpose of the epistle, and the consistency of its contents to the main theme of the epistle, it is perhaps wrong to take the epistle as a perfectly balanced statement of Clement's Christianity. If ethical interests and the concern for law and order predominate, that is the result of the epistle's immediate purpose and not necessarily the result of a departure from apostolic Christianity, as it is often said to be.

In implementing his purposes, Clement draws extensively from the OT, for the most part by direct quotation, but also frequently by allusion. Exhortations, invitations, and appeals to repentance and proper conduct are given directly in the words of Scripture, and these are in turn supported by examples, illustrations, warnings and promises also drawn from the OT. Clement alludes frequently to the language of NT writings, and draws upon both Jewish and Hellenistic tradition in the course of the epistle.

The mixing of Jewish and Hellenistic elements in Clement's epistle has often been remarked upon. On the one hand Clement evinces a knowledge of Jewish homiletical tradition,² employs Jewish language throughout the epistle and, by the direct use of the OT, sets forth as a model a characteristically Jewish piety.³ On the other hand, Clement's epistle also points to a thorough familiarity with Hellenistic rhetoric and philosophy.⁴ It is nothing less than remarkable how Clement brings his every resource—whether Jewish, Christian, or Hellenistic—to bear on the problem in hand, and to add to the forcefulness of his argument. That which dominates all, however, is the use of the Septua-

¹ According to a count by H. Dressler, the epistle contains 70 instances of the use of the hortatory subjunctive, and 24 instances of the direct imperative, apart from the quotations. "Clement I, Pope, St.", *New Catholic Encyclopedia* III (New York, 1967), 926-928.

² See especially K. Beyschlag, *Clemens Romanus und der Fröhenkatholizismus* (Tübingen, 1966). Cf. J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* (Paris, 1958), pp. 53ff; 101-129.

³ The Jewish background of the epistle is set forth by L. W. Barnard, "The Early Roman Church, Judaism, and Jewish-Christianity", *Anglican Theological Review* 49 (1967), 372-378.

⁴ See particularly L. Sanders, *L'Hellénisme de Saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme* (Lovanii, 1943).

gint, and Clement's complete mastery of its contents indicates without question his own personal background within the Hellenistic Synagogue of the Diaspora. This does not, however, necessarily answer the question as to whether Clement was himself born a Jew since it is quite possible that he may have been a Gentile "God-fearer" who practised Judaism. We may be sure, however, that Clement was either a Jew whose Hellenization was complete, or a Greek who had drunk deeply of Jewish thought and practice. On balance, we would with Lightfoot allow the the former as more probable.¹

B. THE TEXT OF THE EPISTLE

Clement's epistle gained an early popularity in the Christian Church, being known to or used by a great number of ancient writers including Polycarp, Hegesippus, Dionysius of Corinth, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius.² It was so highly regarded by the Church at Corinth, according to Dionysius, that it was periodically read for edification, a practice which was indeed followed by many churches according to Eusebius (*HE* III, 16). Clement of Alexandria, who could refer to Clement as "the Apostle Clement" (so too "Apostle" Barnabas), apparently regarded the epistle very highly and quotes from it almost as if he regarded it as Scripture. Our epistle together with 2 Clement would be added at the end of the NT in the fifth century Codex Alexandrinus. The epistle thus seems very nearly to have approached the status of a canonical writing. Nevertheless, despite later assertions of its canonicity (e.g. *Canon apost.* 85; Alexius Aristenus; its position in the twelfth century Harclean Syriac MS of the NT), it is quite doubtful that Clement was regarded as canonical in the early centuries.³

With the coming of the Middle Ages, Clement's epistle seems to have been largely superseded, in the West at least, by the Pseudo-Clementine literature. Thus this epistle, so highly regarded by the earliest Christians, came to be neglected, remaining virtually unknown until the seventeenth century.⁴ In 1625 Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constan-

¹ I, 1, 59f. See also the argument of E. Werner, "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the *Prima Clementis*", *Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume II* (Jerusalem, 1965), p. 817.

² These references and many others are collected by Lightfoot I, 1, 148-200.

³ For a full discussion see Lightfoot I, 1, 366-378.

⁴ An interesting review of the history of the writings known as the "Apostolic Fathers" may be found in R. M. Grant's chapter "The Apostolic Fathers in the Christian Church", *The Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction*, *AF* I (New York, 1964), pp. 13-33.

tinople, offered an ancient Bible codex to King James I (received, however, by Charles I in 1627-28) which was found to contain, following the Apocalypse, the genuine epistle of Clement (except for 57.7-63.4, due to a missing leaf) together with a portion of 2 Clement.¹ This MS, known as Alexandrinus, dates from the fifth century and is today a major witness to the text of the NT and the Greek OT. Patrick Young, librarian of the Royal Library, immediately realized the significance of the Clementine epistles and set about producing the *editio princeps* of the genuine epistle, which appeared in 1633.² Alexandrinus, the means by which Clement became reintroduced to an awakening world of scholarship, today remains the most important witness to the text of the epistle.³

For almost two and a half centuries Alexandrinus constituted the only witness to the text of Clement. In 1875, however, Metropolitan Philotheos Bryennios published 1 and 2 Clement from a MS newly discovered in the library of the Hospice of the Jerusalem Monastery of the Holy Sepulchre in Constantinople.⁴ This MS dated AM 6564 (= AD 1056) and known as Constantinopolitanus or Hierosolymitanus (it now is kept in Jerusalem) is most famous because it first brought to light the Didache in its only complete MS.⁵ It is important for Clement also, however, for in addition to providing an independent witness to the Greek of its epistle, since it was complete (apart from some abbreviations in the longer OT quotations) it supplied the lacuna of the Alexandrian MS.

Very soon after the spectacular find of Bryennios, the Cambridge University Library acquired a Syriac MS from the private library of the French oriental scholar J. Mohl, upon his death in 1876. The MS dated 1169-70 AD is a Syriac translation of the NT, minus the Apocalypse, which is very similar in text-form to the Philoxenian-Harclean

¹ According to the table of contents prefixed to the OT, the MS originally also contained the Psalms of Solomon following the Clementine epistles.

² Patricius Iunius (ed.), *Clementis ad Corinthios epistola prior* (Oxonii, 1633).

³ Codex Alexandrinus is available for direct study by means of an excellent photographic reproduction. *Codex Alexandrinus in Reduced Photographic Facsimile: New Testament and Clementine Epistles*, British Museum (London, 1909). This work also contains an introduction to the Codex and its history by F. G. Kenyon.

⁴ Ph. Bryennios, *ΚΑΗΜΕΝΤΟΣ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης αἱ δύο πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολαί* (Constantinople, 1875).

⁵ The MS additionally contained Barnabas, the letters of Ignatius in their interpolated form, as well as a Synopsis of the OT by Chrysostom.

recension(s). The unique thing about the MS is the position of the Clementine epistles, which follow directly upon the Catholic epistles, but precede the Pauline epistles. Evidently the scribe, at least, regarded the epistles as fully canonical.¹ The translation of our epistle may date from the ninth century, and was edited by and published under the name of R. L. Bensly in 1899.²

In the revision of his edition of Clement in 1890, J. B. Lightfoot incorporated the newly discovered evidence of Constantinopolitanus and the Syriac version to produce a superlative Greek text which today stands in little need of revision.³ At that time Lightfoot cautiously wrote "Whether other *Manuscripts* of these Epistles may not yet be discovered, it is impossible to say".⁴ Less than five years after his death a very early Latin translation of the epistle unexpectedly came to light. In 1893 the Benedictine scholar Dom Germain Morin discovered a Latin MS in the former library of the monastery of St. John the Baptist (founded in 1010 AD at Florrenes, Belgium)—now in the *Grand Séminaire* in Namur—which contained most of the Pseudo-Clementine literature including the genuine epistle.⁵ Although the MS itself dates from the eleventh century, it is evident from the character of the Latin that the translation is very ancient, going back well into the second century. Indeed, the vulgar Latin of this very literalistic translation is important for the history of ecclesiastical Latin and the origins of Latin Christianity in the West.⁶

To the already extensive evidence for the text of Clement were added early in our century two Coptic MSS in the Akhmimic dialect of upper Egypt. The first of these, from the White Monastery of She-

¹ It cannot be safely concluded from this MS that the early Syrian Church regarded the epistles as canonical.

² R. L. Bensly (ed.), *The Epistles of S. Clement to the Corinthians in Syriac* (Cambridge, 1899). Bensly unfortunately died before completing this edition, which was brought to publication by R. H. Kennett. For this reason the edition lacks an introduction.

³ *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part I. S. Clement of Rome, 2 vols. (London, 1890). In 1877 Lightfoot had published a separate volume as an Appendix to his first edition, presenting the new evidence and its bearing upon the epistle.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 1, 146.

⁵ The epistle was edited by Dom Morin and published in 1894. *Sancti Clementis Romani ad Corinthios Epistolae versio latina antiquissima*. Anecdota Maredsolana II (Maredsoli, 1894).

⁶ See C. Mohrmann, "Les Origines de la Latinité Chrétienne à Rome", *VC* 3 (1949), 67-106; 163-183. Cf. C. H. Turner's chapter "St. Clement's Epistle and the Early Roman Church", *Studies in Early Church History* (Oxford, 1912), pp. 220-249.

route, is a fourth century papyrus MS of the whole of Clement's epistle, except for 34.5-42.2, contained in the five missing leaves of the codex. This MS, presently in the Berlin *Staatsbibliothek*, was edited by C. Schmidt in 1908.¹ The second MS, apparently from an independent but related (slightly better) textual tradition, is a very mutilated papyrus fragment which breaks off completely at 26.2. The MS stems probably from the fifth century and also contains portions of the canonical Epistle of James and Gospel of John. Now a possession of the Strasbourg University Library, the MS was obtained by Professors Spiegelberg and Reitzenstein among a large purchase of papyrus MSS, and its exact provenance consequently remains unknown.²

Thus there are, to summarize, six main witnesses to the text of Clement: The Greek MSS, Alexandrinus, which we simply refer to as A, and Constantinopolitanus (= Hierosolymitanus) which we shall call C (some use the symbol H); the Syriac translation, referred to as S; the Latin translation, referred to as L; and the two Coptic translations for which we occasionally use the symbols K¹ and K². Additionally, Clement of Alexandria often quotes the epistle of his Roman namesake extensively and accurately, and these quotations serve as further evidence for the text of our epistle.³ We cannot here enter into a full discussion of the relative merits of these various witnesses. Discussions of this subject can usually be found in the introductions to the MSS which are provided in the printed editions. Especially noteworthy are those of Lightfoot (A, C and S),⁴ Knopf (A, C, S and L),⁵ Schmidt (A, C, S, L and K¹),⁶ and Rösch (all the witnesses).⁷

There is general agreement that among the various MSS A is the superior witness to the text of Clement. Although there is no small number of scribal errors in this MS, as Lightfoot says, "they arise from

¹ C. Schmidt, *Der Erste Clemensbrief in altkoptischen Übersetzung*, TU 32 (Leipzig, 1908).

² It was edited by F. Rösch, *Bruchstücke des Ersten Clemensbriefes nach dem Achmimischen Papyrus des Strassburger Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek* (Strassburg, 1910).

³ A list of these quotations is available in O. Stählin's edition *Clementis Alexandrinus* GCSE (Leipzig, 1905-1936), IV, 27-28. Cf. Lightfoot I, 1, 158ff.

⁴ I, 1, 116-147. Lightfoot's discussion is still of outstanding importance despite the fact that the L, S, and K MSS had not yet been discovered.

⁵ *Der Erste Clemensbrief* TU 20 (Leipzig, 1899), pp. 1-74. Knopf gives an especially full description of the MSS he discusses.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 11-27.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. VII-XXVIII.

petty carelessness and ignorance, and not from perverse ingenuity".¹ C, on the other hand, has not so many blunders on the part of the scribe, but a number of more deliberate "corrections" or alterations. At the same time, since C is not a lineal descendent from A, but both go back to an earlier archetype, it may on occasion preserve a correct reading against that of A. The versions are in themselves inevitably inferior to the Greek MSS as witnesses to Clement's text. Yet when used in conjunction with A and C they are of very great value. The Latin translation, because of its age and exactness, is probably the most valuable of the versions.² Yet at several points it reveals a tendency to modify certain passages in favour of its own viewpoint.³ The Syriac is, on the whole, a careful translation, but it too contains certain differences from the Greek due primarily to expansions and glosses.⁴ The Coptic translations are important because they tend to agree more with A and C than with the Syriac and Latin.⁵

The textual tradition of Clement's epistle as revealed in these witnesses presents a very complicated picture; no consistent pattern can be seen to exist in the relationship between the witnesses. As a result, no one MS or any single combination of MSS (despite the sometimes overambitious claims of certain editors) can be regarded as possessing an absolute authority in establishing the original text of the epistle, and thus each textual uncertainty must be considered individually.

With regard to our special interest, however, it may be pointed out that A is decidedly the best witness to the text of the Septuagint quotations. Whereas A is not afraid to differ from the LXX, there is a persistent tendency on the part of C and all of the versions as well

¹ I, 1, 120.

² See the appendix "On the Value for Textual Purposes of the Latin Versions of St. Clement's Epistle", in C. H. Turner, *op. cit.*, pp. 250-256. Turner regarded L as more valuable than C as a textual witness, concluding "we do not think it is too much to claim the second place in the criticism of the Clementine text for Dom Morin's discovery". (p. 254)

³ For these, see A. Harnack, "Über die jüngst entdeckte lateinische Übersetzung des ersten Klemensbriefes", *Sitzungsberichte der königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Jahrgang 1894, pp. 261-273; "Neue Studien zur jüngst entdeckten lateinischen Übersetzung des ersten Klemensbriefes", *ibid.*, pp. 601-621.

⁴ See Hilgenfeld, "Die Briefe des römischen Klemens und ihre syrische Übersetzung", *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 20 (1877), 549-562; F. X. Funk, "Die syrische Übersetzung der Klemensbriefe", *Theologische Quartalschrift* 59 (1877), 477-498.

⁵ See Turner's "Note on the Newly Discovered Coptic Version of St. Clement's Epistle", *op. cit.*, p. 257.

as the quotations in Clement of Alexandria to harmonize OT quotations with the LXX.¹ In several of the longer OT quotations C is content to abbreviate considerably what the original contained. Thus, beyond the consensus of scholars that A generally reflects a superior text, the text of A is also clearly superior with regard to the quotations. For that reason A is used in the present work as the basic witness to the text of Clement. However, C and the versions have been continually consulted, and the pertinent variants have been noted almost without exception.² In some instances A is abandoned for a reading of C and the versions, but these are rare, and are usually in accord with Lightfoot's masterly judgements.³

Of all Greek writings, the epistle of Clement stands second only to the NT in the wealth of evidence available for purposes of textual criticism.⁴ While the multiplication of witnesses does not necessarily make individual judgements any easier, the total effect is to add to the trustworthiness of the major part of the text. Clement's text is by far the best witnessed of the Apostolic Fathers and this is especially advantageous in the task before us.

C. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF PRESENT WORK

One of the most striking things about Clement's epistle is, as we have already indicated, the extraordinary number of quotations from the OT which it contains. In addition to these OT quotations, however, Clement alludes surprisingly often to a number of NT writings. The latter fact raises some interesting questions: What books of our NT

¹ Many illustrations of this will be seen below in Chapter II.

² As a preliminary exercise at the beginning of the research culminating in the present work, the author produced a notebook in which he collated the texts of A and C (which he transcribed from the photofacsimiles) together with the Latin text for all of the quotations. The Syriac variants were for the most part derived from the apparatus of Lightfoot's edition, and the Coptic variants from the editions of Schmidt and Rösch.

³ Lightfoot's text still stands as a reminder of his skill as a textual critic. Working with A alone, in 1869 Lightfoot produced for his first edition a text with a great number of conjectural readings where A was illegible or deficient. The extent to which these conjectures were substantiated by the discoveries of C and S can only be regarded as remarkable. The text of the second edition is confirmed more often than not by the Latin and Coptic MSS.

⁴ Lightfoot I, 1, 144; Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte: Das Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die korinthische aus der Zeit Domitians* (Leipzig, 1929), p. 7f.; cf. Knopf, *Der Erste Clemensbrief*, p. 74.

does Clement allude to? How did he regard the NT writings? The early date of Clement's epistle makes these questions unusually significant. Yet no full scale monograph exists on the subject of Clement's use of the NT. The only works which discuss the subject to any extent discuss Clement only as one of the Apostolic Fathers or even a larger group, and thus Clement is allotted far less space than necessary.¹

It is clear that a full scale study of Clement's use of the NT is impossible without a thorough examination of his use of the OT. The place to begin in gaining an understanding of Clement's attitude to and use of NT writings is with the extensive OT quotations in the epistle. What is required, then, for an adequate monograph is a full study of Clement's use of both the OT and the NT writings, and it is this need which the present work is designed to meet. To be sure, a thorough study of Clement's use of the OT could itself fill a lengthy volume. But here, since one of our major interests is Clement's use of the NT, the discussion of Clement's OT quotations is necessarily somewhat restricted. Yet the section on the OT is not merely preparatory for the discussion of Clement's use of the NT, but is meant in itself to be a contribution to the understanding of Clement's use of the OT.²

In the present work, the main areas of interest are text and canon, but it has been thought good, for the sake of completeness, to include a brief discussion of interpretation in Clement's epistle. Owing to the nature of the subject and Clement's position in time as well as his own method of quotation and allusion, the question of text is more important for the OT, and the question concerning canon (or the beginnings thereof) more important for the NT writings. In the OT section our main task will be to compare the text of Clement's Septuagint quotations with the main textual witnesses of the Septuagint which have come down to us. This is of interest not only to Clement's habit of

¹ The standard work in this field—and the only comprehensive work covering the whole of the NT writings—is *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, by the Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology (Oxford, 1905). See also L. A. Foster, "Clement of Rome and His Literary Sources", (Harvard Ph. D. Thesis, 1958), pp. 163-184. For other works which include relatively brief discussions of Clement, see p. 278, note 2.

² Surprisingly little has been written on Clement's use of OT quotations. W. Wrede devoted a chapter ("Der erste Klemensbrief und das Alte Testament") to the subject in his little volume *Untersuchungen zum ersten Klemensbriefe* (Göttingen, 1891), pp. 58-111. Very short studies can be found in H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, 1902), pp. 406-414; and W. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, (London, 1876), pp. 25-37. See also L. A. Foster, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-162.

quotation, but to the early history of the text of the Septuagint.¹ In the NT section the main task is to establish as far as possible which books of the NT Clement was actually acquainted with,² but we shall also be concerned with his evaluation of these writings.

One of our major tasks is to attempt to account for deviations from the OT text, as well as for the free manner of allusion to the NT writings. Consequently in both sections there is a preoccupation with source determination. Is Clement dependent upon the writings in question or are we to look for alternative sources? This is a question which cannot be answered simply but which must be dealt with separately in each case. Even then opinion will differ from one person to the next as to the most plausible answers.

Indeed, the whole question of literary dependence, with which we are largely concerned in the following pages, is so difficult that one cannot expect much agreement among scholars. This is no reason, however, to avoid discussion of the subject, or to refuse to come to conclusions one way or the other. Inevitably, however, one's basic approach, with its initial convictions will betray itself in any such argument. Thus at the beginning it may be well to indicate our own perspective. A basic premise we hold to in the following study is that when a known source is readily available, it is difficult to argue probable dependence in another direction without the strongest of evidence. Without question, for example, extra-biblical sources, both oral and written, were available to Clement when he wrote his epistle. Yet one problem with these sources is that we are here usually dealing with the unknown, so far as actual content is concerned. Since that is the case, we are rather reluctant to appeal to extra-biblical sources when the parallels are explainable on the basis of dependence upon our OT and NT writings. At the same time, although this is a basic conviction underlying the present work, it is not followed blindly or absolutely in the pages which follow. The question which the author continually

¹ Sanday long ago wrote that "it would be well if monographs were written upon all the quotations from the Old Testament in the Christian literature of the first two centuries". *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 359. While this has been accomplished for most of the NT writers and some later writers as well, the Apostolic Fathers have been singularly neglected.

² Harnack, at the end of his study on Clement, mentions a number of topics which yet require further research. In addition to the OT citations and the LXX, he mentions in particular Clement's possible use of certain NT epistles. *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 100.

put to himself was not merely *Can* the parallels be explained in a certain way?, but more importantly, with a careful assessment of all the relevant information which can be gathered, *Ought* the parallels to be explained in a certain way? That is, we have concerned ourselves not merely with the question of *possibility*, but also with the determination of *probability*. Here, however, there is no escape from subjective judgements. The very notion of "probability" is highly relative, depending upon the extent of the evidence and the evaluation put upon it by the interpreter. Probability, although it is much stronger than possibility, always falls short of certainty. Such is the nature of our work and although we believe our arguments are valid, they necessarily remain somewhat tenuous. We can only repeat as our own sentiment that of the Oxford Committee—with whom we have not always agreed in the chapters which follow: "The editors are quite aware that their judgements may not command universal assent; but they may claim at least that these judgements have been carefully formed, sometimes after considerable hesitation".¹

In the OT section we are concerned exclusively with clear quotations, and thus bypass the considerable number of OT allusions in the epistle. In the NT section we have discussed only the relatively clear allusions and we have not brought forward the more remote possibilities, the list of which is seemingly endless. The words "citation" and "quotation" are used interchangeably in the following pages.

The specialized subject of the present work prohibits any full discussion of the many interesting questions connected with the content of Clement's epistle. We are concerned with the various views which have been set forth concerning the epistle only insofar as they affect our main purpose. No attempt has been made to discuss the history of the research of the epistle.² Similarly, the bibliographical references are primarily those which concern the present subject, and are not in themselves intended to be exhaustive so far as study of the epistle is concerned.³

It would be amiss at the end of this introduction not to refer to

¹ *NTAF*, p. III.

² An excellent survey of modern research on the epistle is available in K. Beyschlag's chapter "Die Clemensforschung seit v. Harnack", *op. cit.*, pp. 1-47. For a full listing of works prior to Harnack, see Gebhardt and Harnack, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* (Lipsiae, 1876), pp. xviii-xxiv.

³ Full bibliographies are available in the standard patrologies. For bibliographical material one may also see the full footnotes of Beyschlag's volume.

J. B. Lightfoot's incomparable two volumes on Clement,¹ to which the present work is so much indebted. It is hardly conceivable that this monument of scholarship will ever be completely replaced in the future.² The introductory material, comprising the entire first volume, is exhaustively thorough, and the text and commentary found in volume two are a model of careful and judicious scholarship. One no less than Harnack—although differing from Lightfoot on a number of points—paid tribute to Lightfoot as the outstanding commentator on the epistle.³ Harnack himself is the other great authority on Clement, having early written a short commentary on the epistle⁴ as well as an exceptionally valuable monograph, whose small size is deceptive.⁵ It is a tribute to Clement's epistle that these two great scholars, of such different backgrounds, both possessed a life-long interest in the epistle and both produced volumes devoted to its study as their last published works.

¹ *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part I. S. Clement of Rome, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (London, 1890). Equally valuable is Part II. S. Ignatius and S. Polycarp, 3 vols. (London, 1889).

² The commentaries of Knopf, *Die Apostolischen Väter. Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel, Die Zwei Clemensbriefe* HZNT, Ergänzungsband 1. (Tübingen, 1920), and most recently R. M. Grant, *First and Second Clement*, *AF* II (New York, 1965), although useful in themselves, do not detract from the value of Lightfoot.

³ See *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, pp. 7; 56.

⁴ Gebhardt and Harnack, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* (Lipsiae, 1876).

⁵ *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte: Das Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die korinthische aus der Zeit Domitians* (Leipzig, 1929).

PART ONE

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN CLEMENT'S EPISTLE

CHAPTER ONE

QUOTATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN CLEMENT, THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

From its inception the Christian Church received the Jewish Scriptures as inspired and authoritative. The Christians of the first and second centuries regarded the writings of the Old Testament as nothing other than Christian writings; these writings were seen to anticipate Christ and the Church, not only in a directly prophetic sense, but indirectly in providing valuable teaching for the day-to-day life of the Church.¹

This is evident both from the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers, but preeminently from Clement's epistle. Clement, intent on counteracting the tragic situation at Corinth, devotes approximately one-fourth of his epistle to direct quotations from Old Testament (and apocryphal) writings. It is these quotations in fact which provide him with the materials of his argument. They are, however, not only of intrinsic importance to Clement's epistle, but are also indirectly of great importance in indicating the state of the Old Testament Scriptures in Rome about AD 95.

What we propose to do in the present chapter is to look at Clement's quotations generally, to examine in some detail the introductory formulae used with them, and also, by way of setting Clement in the context of the early Church, to compare—again generally—Clement's use of the Old Testament with that found in the New Testament and the other Apostolic Fathers.

A. FREQUENCY OF CITATION

Clement's extensive quotation of the OT is particularly impressive. The fact that a quarter of the epistle is given over to direct quotations has led to the description of Clement as "a born quoter".² Moreover, the very language of Clement's epistle is often filled with OT allusions,

¹ Cf. 2 Tim. 3.16.

² Thus G. H. Rendall, *The Epistle of James and Judaic Christianity* (Cambridge, 1927), p. 102.

further indicating that his knowledge of the OT writings was extraordinary.¹ While we are not concerned with these allusions here, special attention may be called to the considerable echoes of the OT which are found in Clement's great prayer in chapters 59 and 60.² There are as well other allusions in the epistle, a few of which may in fact be clear enough to be classed as quotations without formulae, e.g. 51.4 (Nu. 16.33 and Ps. 48.15); 2.8 (Pr. 7.3); and 17.5 (Nu. 12.7, but cf. Heb. 3.2).³

Leaving aside allusions, however, we turn to what can only be regarded as deliberate citations. Allowing for some variability in reckoning, we may say that the number of direct citations in Clement is approximately 75.⁴ Since a few of these are citations from the Apocrypha and other non-canonical writings, we may suggest as a round number, 70 OT citations in Clement's epistle.⁵ The majority of those quotations are of moderate length, although some are rather lengthy. The following are particularly noteworthy because of their unusual length :

the quotation of the whole of Is. 53 in chapter 16;
almost the whole of Ps. 50 in chapter 18;
Job 4.16-5.5 in chapter 39;
Job 5.17-26 in chapter 56;
Pr. 1.23-33 in chapter 57;
Gn. 4.3-8 in chapter 4;
Ps. 49.16-23 in chapter 35;
Ps. 33.12-18 in chapter 22;
and Is. 1.16-20 in chapter 8.⁶

¹ Harnack justly says "der Brief selbst spricht die Sprache des A.T.; sie ist ihm religiöse Sprache". *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte* p. 66, n. 2.

² There is close verbal agreement with the LXX in many of the allusions. Lightfoot prints these in capitals in his edition. The allusions are drawn mainly from the Psalms, as might be expected, but also from Isaiah, Job, Deuteronomy, 1 Samuel and 1 Kings. See Lightfoot I, 2, 172-179. The prayer may also contain language drawn from the Lucan nativity account. See below, p. 169f.

³ Of less importance are those found in 3.3 (Is. 3.5); 3.4 (Is. 59.14); 20.6 (Gn. 1.9); 43.1 (Nu. 12.7; but cf. Heb. 3.5); and 51.5 (Ex. 14.23).

⁴ W. Wrede counts more than 70 proper citations, and more than 20 reminiscences. *Untersuchungen zum ersten Klemensbriefe* p. 60. Harnack speaks of approximately 120 OT citations and allusions, apart from linguistic reminiscences. *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 66.

⁵ A full tabulation of these will be found in Appendix I.

⁶ In connection with these lengthy quotations, it is interesting to note that the scribe

More than one-third of the OT citations in Clement are derived from the Psalms. The next most frequently quoted books are Isaiah, Job, Genesis, and Proverbs. These five books thus apparently hold a special place in Clement's library. Other OT writings which are quoted play a relatively minor part in the epistle. Many shorter books are not quoted at all, and there is but a single quotation from the Minor Prophets (Mal. 3.1, conflated with Is. 13.22, in 23.5).

How does this compare with the use of the OT in the NT? Clement's epistle has more citations than any single NT book, Romans having 56, Luke-Acts 51, Mt. 41, and Heb. 35.¹ Luke-Acts together is by comparison more than four times as long as Clement's epistle, and Matthew is approximately twice as long, so that in these narrative writings the frequency of quotations is nowhere near that of Clement's epistle. Romans, on the other hand, is only 85 per cent as long as Clement and proportionately falls only slightly below Clement in the frequency of quotations. Hebrews is more than half as long as Clement's epistle and thus the frequency of quotations approaches that of Clement. These comparisons, however, can be misleading since they fail to take the length of the quotations into account. No writing of the NT contains as many long quotations as Clement, and in no NT writing does the quotation material compose so large a percentage of the total contents as it does in Clement.²

In the NT as a whole, as in Clement, the Psalms are the most quoted and Isaiah the second most quoted of writings. Quoted about half as often as these, but still frequently are Deuteronomy, Exodus, and Genesis. Other OT writings are quoted relatively seldom. A contrast that is immediately apparent, however, is Clement's extensive use of Job and Proverbs and, on the other hand, the small use of these books in the NT. For Clement's seven quotations from Job (some very long)

of C apparently felt it unnecessary to quote more than the first sentence of the passages from Pss. 50, 33 and 49, whether because the full passages were well-known or considered irrelevant to Clement's argument, we cannot say. (Lightfoot speaks of the scribe as "impatient". I, 1, 28). In the Ps. 49 passage he does pick up the final words to make the link with the word *σωτήριον* in the beginning of chapter 36. In the other long quotations C provides the whole text, at the end of chapter 57 giving us the Greek of Clement's text where A is defective.

¹ The statistics used here and in the following paragraphs are based on D. M. Turpie's volume *The NT View of the Old* (London, 1872), pp. 1-16.

² It is not difficult to believe that one early argument against the inclusion of Clement's epistle in the NT canon was that such a large portion of the epistle consisted merely of quotations taken directly from the LXX.

we have one brief quotation from Job in the whole of the NT (1 Cor. 3.19; but cf. also Phil. 1.19). Similarly, for Clement's six citations from Proverbs, the entire NT contains only six citations, James (with two citations) being the only NT writing which contains more than one.

It is interesting to note that the general use of the OT in the NT is particularly reflected in certain NT books which Clement knew. Thus Hebrews and Romans both reveal a very high use of the Psalms (together accounting for half of the Psalm citations in the NT); and Romans contains more than a third of the NT citations of Isaiah, and also more Genesis citations than any other NT book. This similarity of usage in these particular books and Clement's epistle, however, is probably due not to any causal relationship, but is simply indicative of the natural popularity of certain OT writings in the early Church. For the most part, then, the general pattern of OT usage found in Clement, agrees with that found in the NT. The notable exception to this statement is Clement's predilection for Job¹ and Proverbs, which is quite probably related to the immediate purpose of the epistle.

Turning to the Apostolic Fathers, we find that the epistle of Clement and Barnabas stand apart from the others in their extensive use of the OT. Barnabas, indeed, outdoes Clement in the quotation of the OT. To be sure, there are not the lengthy quotations found in Clement, nor as many exact or nearly exact quotations from the LXX. There are, however, many citations and many paraphrastic renderings, and the number of these together which are introduced with formulae approaches one hundred.² A number of these may perhaps derive from non-canonical sources.³ However, of those that are clearly canonical, about one-fourth are from Isaiah, and a considerable number are from the Psalms. The Pentateuch, particularly Genesis, is also important

¹ R. P. C. Hanson has pointed out that the Book of Job is more important for Paul than is usually thought, and can be seen as the background to several important passages in his epistles. "St. Paul's Quotations of the Book of Job", *Theology* 53 (1950), 250-253. Clement's extensive use of Job is perhaps consistent with Hanson's claim that it constitutes "the summit of development and final word in the Old Testament" (p. 253).

² Thus R. A. Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, AF III (New York, 1965), p. 19.

³ Kraft traces many of these quotations to various kinds of traditional materials viz. apocalyptic, hymnic, legal/cultic (halakhic), narrative (haggadic), and miscellaneous unidentified materials. *Ibid.*, pp. 20; 182-184. H. B. Swete, however, attributed most of these quotations to various degrees of freedom in quotation of the LXX. See *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* p. 412f.

for the author of Barnabas. Thus in the frequent use of Isaiah, Psalms, and Genesis, as well as in the moderate use of other writings, Barnabas is not dissimilar to Clement. Only with regard to the use of Job (no quotations) and Proverbs (one quotation) does Barnabas differ radically from Clement.

The only other writing included in the Apostolic Fathers which contains a substantial number of OT quotations is that known as 2 Clement. There, out of approximately fifteen quotations, nine are from Isaiah, but surprisingly only one each from the Psalms and Genesis.¹ No quotations from Job are to be found, and only one from Proverbs.²

The remaining Apostolic Fathers use the OT only sparingly, if at all. In the longest of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, Hermas' *Shepherd*, there are no quotations from the OT at all.³ There are only two explicit OT quotations in the Didache (Zechariah and Malachi); additionally, in the Two Ways section there are a few allusions to the Pentateuch, and only one to the Psalms (Ps. 36.11a, in Did. 3.7; but cf. Mt. 5.5). In the epistles of Ignatius only two explicit quotations are to be found, but interestingly both are from Proverbs (3.34 in *Eph.* 5.3; and 18.17 in *Magn.* 12.1). In addition to a couple of brief allusions, there is also a quotation of Is. 52.5 (without introductory formula) in *Tral.* 8.2. Similarly, in Polycarp's epistle there are very few OT quotations. Is. 52.5 is again quoted (*Phil.* 10.3); Ps. 4.5 is quoted in *Phil.* 12.1 (where, however, it is combined with Eph. 4.26 under the same formula); and Pr. 3.4 is found in *Phil.* 6.1.

Clement and Barnabas, then, are unique among the Apostolic Fathers in their abundant use of OT writings. The extensive use of the OT in the epistle of Barnabas is, in fact, to be expected in the light of the author's intention to indicate the correct (i.e. Christian) understanding of the OT. In the case of Clement, however, the extensive use of the OT can only be surprising since the epistle is written exclusively out of pastoral concern for the practical problems of the Corinthian Church. Clement is peculiar among early Christian writers in this very liberal use of OT quotations for paraenetic purposes. While for the most part Clement quotes those writings which were popular in the early Church, his frequent use of Proverbs and especially Job can be seen to be anomalous.

¹ See Grant, *AF* II, 133f.

² This however is the maxim ἀγάπη δὲ καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν (16.4), which may alternatively be explained as dependent either upon 1 Pet. 4.8 or 1 Cl. 49.5.

³ See G. F. Snyder, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, *AF* VI (Camden, 1968), 13.

B. THE USE OF INTRODUCTORY FORMULAE

Clement introduces nearly all of his OT quotations with introductory words of some kind, although not in every case is the designation "formula" completely satisfactory. Clement does not limit himself to stereotyped formulae, but uses a great variety of introductory clauses. For the sake of clarity, we now list these formulae under the following main categories: those employing (1) *γράφει*, or some derivative thereof; (2) *λέγει*; (3) *εἶπεν*; and (4) *φησί*. To these we add (5) miscellaneous introductions; a separate section (6) containing those formulae which are derived from the narrative and/or point to the human author rather than to the divine character of the quoted words; (7) a list of the passages without formulae; and (8) a list of the formulae used with non-canonical writings. While these categories would normally involve some overlapping, this has been avoided in most cases by giving preference to the first category, and by not including the components of the sixth category in their respective places in the earlier categories; thus each passage finds only one mention in the following.

(1) *γέγραπται*

- 4.1-6 (Gn. 4.3-8) *γ. γὰρ οὕτως*
 14.4 (Pr. 2.21f. combined with Ps. 36.38a) *γ. γάρ*
 17.3 (Job 1.1) *καὶ περὶ Ἰὼβ οὕτως γ.*
 29.2 (Dt. 32.8-9) *οὕτω γὰρ γ.*
 36.3 (Ps. 103.4) *γ. γὰρ οὕτως*
 39.3-9 (Job 4.16-5.5 with 15.15) *γ. γάρ*
 48.2 (Ps. 117.19f.) *καθὼς γ.*
 50.4 (Is. 26.20 combined with [?] Ezk. 37.12) *γ. γάρ*
 50.6 (Ps. 31.1f.) *γ. γάρ*

τὸ γεγραμμένον

- 3.1 (Dt. 32.15) *καὶ ἐπετελέσθη τ. γ.*
 [cf. 13.1]

τὸ γραφεῖον

- 28.3 (Ps. 138.7-9) *λέγει γάρ που τ. γ.*

ἡ γραφή

- 23.5 (Is. 13.22 with Mal. 3.1) *συνεπιμαρτυρούσης καὶ τ. γραφῆς*
 34.6 (Dn. 7.10 with Is. 6.3) *λέγει γὰρ ἡ γ.*
 35.7 (Ps. 49.16-23) *λέγει γὰρ ἡ γ.*
 42.5 (Is. 60.17) *οὕτως γὰρ που λέγει ἡ γ.*

(2) λέγει

- 8.4 (Is. 1.16-20) καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ λ. οὕτως
 10.3 (Gn. 12.1-3) λ. [ὁ θεός] γὰρ αὐτῷ
 13.1 (Je. 9.23-24) λ. γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον
 15.2 (Is. 29.13) λ. γάρ που
 21.2 (Pr. 20.27) λ. γάρ που
 26.2 (Ps. 27.7) λ. γάρ που
 29.3 (? Dt. 4.34; Ezk. 48.12; etc.) καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ λ.
 30.4 (Job 11.2,3) λ. γάρ
 34.8 (? Is. 64.3; 65.16; but cf. 1 Cor. 2.9) λ. γάρ
 57.3 (Pr. 1.23-33) οὕτως γὰρ λ. ἡ πανάρετος σοφία
 10.6 (Gn. 15.5-6) καὶ πάλιν λ.
 14.5 (Ps. 36.35-37) καὶ πάλιν λ.
 15.4 (Ps. 77.36-37) καὶ πάλιν λ.
 36.5 (Ps. 109.1) καὶ πάλιν λ. [ὁ δεσπότης] πρὸς αὐτόν
 46.3 (Ps. 17.26-27) καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ λ.
 52.3 (Ps. 49.14-15) καὶ πάλιν λ.
 56.6 (Job 5.17-26) καὶ πάλιν λ.

καὶ πάλιν (with λέγει understood)

- 15.3 (Ps. 61.5) καὶ πάλιν
 15.5 (Ps. 11.4-6) καὶ πάλιν

προλέγει

- 34.3 (Is. 40.10; 62.11; Pr. 24.12) προλέγει γὰρ ἡμῖν

(3) εἶπεν

- 10.4 (Gn. 13.14-16) ε. αὐτῷ ὁ θεός
 18.1 (Ps. 88.21; 1 Sa. 13.14; but cf. Acts 13.22) ε. ὁ θεός
 20.7 (Job 38.11) ε. γὰρ [ὁ θεός]
 33.6 (Gn. 1.28) καὶ ε. [ὁ θεός]
 36.4 (Ps. 2.7f.) οὕτως ε. ὁ δεσπότης
 53.2 (Dt. 9.12-14) ε. πρὸς αὐτόν ὁ θεός

(4) φησί

- 13.4 (Is. 66.2) φ. γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος λόγος
 16.2-16 (Is. 53) καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐλάλησεν, φ. γάρ
 16.15 (Ps. 21.7-9) καὶ πάλιν αὐτὸς [ὁ Χριστός] φ.
 30.2 (Pr. 3.34; but cf. Jas. 4.6 and 1 Pet. 5.5) ... γὰρ φ.
 33.5 (Gn. 1.26f.) οὕτως γὰρ φ. ὁ θεός
 56.3 (Ps. 117.18) οὕτως γὰρ φ. ὁ ἅγιος λόγος
 56.5 (Ps. 140.5) ... φ.

(5) Miscellaneous :

- 8.2 (? Ezk. 33.11) *καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ δεσπότης ... ἐλάλησεν μετὰ ὄρκου*
 8.3 (? Ezk. 18.30f; Ps. 102.10f; Je. 3.19f; Is. 1.18) *προσθεὶς καὶ γνώμην ἀγαθήν*
 22.1-7 (Ps. 33.12-18) *καὶ γὰρ αὐτός [Χριστός] διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου οὕτως προσκαλεῖται ἡμᾶς*
 32.2 (Gn. 15.5 combined with Gn. 22.17 or 26.4) *ὡς ἐπαγγειλαμένου τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι*

(6) Formulae derived from the narrative and/or pointing to the human author :

- 4.10 (Ex. 2.14) *ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁμοφύλου*
 6.3 (Gn. 2.23) *τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀδάμ*
 12.4 (Jos. 2.3) *ἐπισταθέντων δὲ τῶν παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ λεγόντων*
 12.4 (Jos. 2.4f.) *ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη*
 12.5 (Jos. 2.9,13f.) *καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς ἄνδρας*
 12.6 (Jos. 2.18f.,21) *καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῇ*
 17.2 (Gn. 18.27) *λέγει [Ἀβραάμ]*
 17.4 (Job 14.4f.) *ἀλλ' αὐτὸς [Ἰώβ] ἑαυτοῦ κατηγορεῖ λέγων*
 17.5 (Ex. 3.11; 4.10) *ἀλλ' εἶπεν [Μωϋσῆς]*
 18.2 (Ps. 50.3-19) *ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτός [Δαυὶδ] λέγει πρὸς τὸν θεόν*
 26.3 (Job 19.26) *καὶ πάλιν Ἰώβ λέγει*
 52.2 (Ps. 68.31f.) *φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς Δαυὶδ*
 53.3 (Dt. 9.13f.) *καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν*
 53.4 (Ex. 32.32) *καὶ εἶπεν Μωϋσῆς*

(7) Quoted passages without formulae :

- 22.8 (Ps. 31.10) attached to preceding citation (C, however, inserts *εἶτα*)
 56.4 (Pr. 3.12; cf. Heb. 12.6) attached to preceding citation

With introductory connectives :

- 15.5 (Ps. 30.19) *διὰ τοῦτο*
 27.7 (Ps. 18.2-4) *εἰ*
 54.3 (Ps. 23.1) ... *γάρ*
 52.3 (Ps. 50.19) ... *γάρ*

(8) Formulae used with non-canonical writings :

- 17.6 (?) *καὶ πάλιν λέγει*
 23.3 (?) *πόρρω γενέσθω ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη, ὅπου λέγει*
 46.2 (?) *γέγραπται γάρ*

It is clear from the above, that Clement is by no means mechanical in his use of formulae, but that he freely varies in his choice, occasionally revealing both stylistic and dogmatic motivations. Many formulae indicate his convictions of the divine authority of Scripture, its words being attributed to *ὁ θεός* in 10.4; 18.1; 33.5; 53.2 (implicitly 10.3; 20.7; 32.2; 33.6); to *ὁ δεσπότης* in 8.2; 36.4 (implicitly 36.5); to *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον* in 13.1; 16.2, and to *ὁ Χριστός* in 22.1 (implicitly 16.15). In addition to the use of *γέγραπται* and the title *ἡ γραφή*, Clement twice speaks of *ὁ ἅγιος λόγος* (13.4; 56.3) and once of *ἡ πανάρετος σοφία* (57.3). A considerable number of formulae, on the other hand, refer to the human source of the words: Adam (6.3), Abraham (17.2), Job (17.4; 26.3), Moses (17.5; 53.4), David (18.2; 52.2), Rahab and the spies (12), and the quarrelsome Hebrew in Egypt (4.10).

These references to specific OT persons also serve as an aid in helping the reader to locate or recall the context of the quoted passages. However, beyond these incidental indicators, only in 17.3, where Clement writes *καὶ περὶ Ἰώβ οὕτως γέγραπται*,¹ and in 57.3, where *ἡ πανάρετος σοφία* probably constitutes a popular title of Proverbs,² does Clement point to the source of a quotation. The vast majority of quotations are introduced with formulae which are general and provide no assistance in locating the quotation. In several places Clement makes the reference explicitly indefinite by employing the adverb *πού* (15.2; 21.2; 26.2; 28.3; 42.5). In another place Clement tantalizes us with *ὅπου* when quoting a passage of unknown origin (23.3); occasionally Clement is content simply to add *ἐν ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ* (8.4; 29.3; 46.3). It seems probable that Clement did not bother to look up these particular quotations since most of them vary considerably from our LXX text.

Very few quotations are presented without some kind of introductory words. Two conspicuous examples concern the apocryphal book Wisdom (Wisd. 2.24 in Cl. 3.4; Wisd. 12.12 in Cl. 27.5) and are thus not found in the list which has been given. It is interesting that no quotation from the writings which we designate "Apocrypha" is introduced

¹ The *περὶ Ἰώβ* is redundant, however, since the quotation begins with a reference to Job.

² Eusebius writes that Hegesippus, Irenaeus, *καὶ ὁ πᾶς τῶν ἀρχαίων Χορὸς πανάρετον Σοφίαν τὰς Σολομῶνος Παροιμίας ἐκάλουν*. *HE* IV, 22, 9. Grant, however, contends that *σοφία* refers to the speaker in the passage, not to a particular book. *AF* II, 90. See below, p. 117.

with a formula. This is not to be regarded as significant, however, since Clement does employ formulae with other non-canonical writings. Canonical quotations without formulae are rare and usually result from being tacked onto another quotation which has already been properly introduced.

When we turn to the use of introductory formulae with OT quotations in the NT, we find no radical difference from that of Clement.¹ There are in the NT, as in Clement, a large variety of introductory formulae. The standard formulae employing *γέγραπται*, *λέγει*, *εἶπεν* are used with an equal degree of frequency; *φησί*, on the other hand, is seldom used in formulae in the NT (1 Cor. 6.16; Heb. 8.5). The substantives *ἡ γραφή* and *τὸ γεγραμμένον* are common in the NT; Clement's *τὸ γραφεῖον* (28.3), however, is not used in the NT. Also lacking in the NT are the phrases *ὁ ἅγιος λόγος*, (Cl. 13.4; 56.3; cf. Rom. 1.2 *γραφαὶ ἅγαι*) and *ἡ πανάρετος σοφία* (Cl. 57.3).

Clement also employs two interesting verbs in introductory formulae, *ἐπιτελέω* (3.1) and *προλέγω* (34.3), neither of which are thus used in the NT. One of the most notable differences between Clement and the NT, however, is the fact that Clement fails to use the verb *πληρόω* in introductory formulae, although it is fairly frequent in the NT (especially Mt.). This is the more surprising since Clement could have used the verb to good advantage on more than one occasion in the argument of the epistle.²

In the NT, as in Clement, the words of the Scriptures are regarded as having been spoken by God. Thus *θεός* is found as speaker in the formulae (e.g. Mt. 15.4; Acts 3.21; 2 Cor. 6.16) as is *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον* (Heb. 3.7; 10.15). The NT does not use the title *δεσπότης* in introductory formulae, and only implicitly, if at all, refers to Christ as the speaker of OT words (e.g. *κύριος*, in Rom. 12.19; 1 Cor. 14.21; 2 Cor. 6.17; cf. Heb. 10.30). Like Clement, the NT writers also frequently refer to the human authors of Scripture in the introductory formulae. Among these specific references, Moses and David are prominent in

¹ A full scale study of introductory formulae in the NT can be found in D. M. Turpie, *The NT View of the Old*. For a specialized study of formulae in Paul, see O. Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel* (Gütersloh, 1929), pp. 68-72; E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the OT* (London, 1957), p. 22ff. Cf. also B. M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishna", *JBL* 70 (1951), 297-307.

² Metzger points out the failure of the Mishna to employ introductory formulae with the verbs *πληροῦν*, *ἀναπληροῦν*, or *τελειοῦν* as the most significant difference between formulae in the NT and the Mishna. *Op. cit.*, p. 306f.

both Clement and the NT; Clement, however, is unique in twice referring to Job.

Formulae which are explicitly indefinite, employing *πού*, are in the NT found only in Heb. 2.6 and 4.4; *καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει* (with *τόπω* understood) is found in Acts 13.35 and Heb. 5.6. The simple *πάλιν* is found occasionally, used just as it is in Clement (e.g. Rom. 15.10-12; Heb. 1.5; 2.13; 10.30), and in other instances mere connectives take the place of formulae. Again, as in Clement, the number of quotations which do not have introductory formulae is relatively small.

In general, then, Clement's use of introductory formulae is quite in accord with that of the NT. In particular, it may perhaps be said that Clement's usage is more like that of the author of Hebrews than any other NT writer. Like the author of Hebrews, Clement is frequently content to bypass any mention of the human author, using the indefinite formula *λέγει*, or referring directly to God as the source of the words.¹ In the whole of the NT, only in Hebrews do we encounter formulae in which the Holy Spirit is said to speak directly from the Scriptures without mention of the human mediator (Heb. 3.7; 10.15; cf. Cl. 13.1; 16.2). Further, only in Hebrews (2.6; 4.4) is found the explicitly indefinite formula employing *πού*, which occurs relatively often in Clement's epistle. In contrast, however, nowhere is the introductory formula *γέγραπται* met with in Hebrews, although it is fairly common in Clement. Since Clement was thoroughly familiar with the Epistle to the Hebrews it is not difficult to believe that it exercised some influence on his choice of introductory formulae.²

Looking at the Apostolic Fathers, by way of comparison, we may begin with Barnabas, wherein the introductory formulae are even more numerous than in Clement. As in Clement, these formulae again take a great variety of forms.³ The divine authority of Scripture is readily apparent from such formulae as *λέγει ὁ θεός* (5.12b; cf. 2.10), *λέγει κύριος* (6.13b, 16; 16.2b), and the interesting *λέγει*

¹ Michel, however, makes the difference between Paul and Hebrews on this matter too absolute. *Op. cit.*, p. 68f. Ellis indicates that Paul six times uses *λέγει* without a subject as an introductory formula, and four times makes God the subject of the introductory verb. On the other hand, Hebrews occasionally refers to the human authors of Scripture (e.g. 9.20; 12.21; cf. 4.7). *Op. cit.*, p. 24f. Cf. W. Leonard, *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1939), p. 272ff; Wrede, *op. cit.*, p. 74ff.

² See below, p. 193.

³ A convenient list of the introductory formulae in Barnabas can be found in Kraft, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-184.

κύριος ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ (9.1a; cf. 6.14b). In Barnabas, the title *δεσπότης* is not used in introductory formulae, and Christ is not explicitly indicated as the speaker in OT passages, although this may be implied in some of the *κύριος* formulae. Barnabas in one place uses the formula *καὶ πάλιν τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου προφητεύει* (9.2b; cf. 6.14; 12.2), but does not use *λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον* as in Clement. Many formulae, on the other hand, point to the human author, the mention of Moses, David, and Isaiah being particularly frequent. In one instance the formula given is quite specific: *γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς δέκα λόγοις, ἐν οἷς ἐλάλησεν ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾶ πρὸς Μωϋσῆν κατὰ πρόσωπον* (15.1). While Barnabas does not employ *πού* in his introductory formulae, he very often employs the indefinite *λέγει ὁ προφήτης* or *ἐν ἐτέρῳ προφήτῃ λέγει*.¹ The standard formulae *λέγει ἡ γραφή* and *γέγραπται* are both found in Barnabas. As in Clement, the occurrence of quotations without formulae is rare, and most often the result of composite quotations. Again similar to Clement is the fact that in not a few places formulae are used with quotations apparently from an unknown source (e.g. 2.10a; 6.10c, 13b; 7.4; 11.9). What is particularly unique about the introductory formulae in Barnabas, then, is the large number which have for their subject *ὁ προφήτης*—something which does not occur in Clement. However, apart from this and a few other minor differences, the use of introductory formulae in the two writings is very similar.

In the only other Apostolic Father who quotes fairly often from the OT, 2 Clement, a substantial number of the OT quotations occur without formulae. Most of these are relatively brief and are merely worked into the text rather than being set apart. The formulae which do occur are standard and varied.² Although 2 Clement does not use *γέγραπται*, *λέγει ἡ γραφή* is found, as well as three other formulae employing *γραφὴ* (one referring to Mt. 9.13). There are formulae which indicate *ὁ θεός* (15.3) and *ὁ κύριος* (13.2; 17.4) as speaker and in 3.5 Christ is possibly the speaker (in the formula *λέγει δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὑσαΐα*). The Holy Spirit is not mentioned in the formulae of 2 Clement; human authors are mentioned only twice (Isaiah in 3.5; and Ezekiel in 6.8), and then not directly as speakers of the words of

¹ For Barnabas, every author of Scripture is apparently regarded as a "prophet". Thus the formulae which speak of *ὁ προφήτης* introduce passages not only from the Prophets, but also from the Torah and Kethubim.

² A complete list of these is found in Grant, *AF* II, 133f.

Scripture, but merely as indicators (thus, in the dative case) of the location of certain passages. In one conspicuous instance (11.2ff.), 2 Clement quotes a non-canonical writing with an introductory formula, λέγει γὰρ καὶ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος. The passage quoted is found also in 1 Cl. 23.3 with some variations, where it is introduced as ἡ γραφή. Again, it may be said that while 2 Clement lacks some of the distinctive features of the introductory formulae in 1 Clement, there is some similarity as well.

Since OT quotations are infrequent in the remaining Apostolic Fathers, introductory formulae are few. In the Didache, two formulae occur: αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ῥηθεῖσα ὑπὸ κυρίου (14.3), and ὡς ἐρρέθη (16.7). An additional formula introduces a non-canonical quotation, καὶ περὶ τούτου δὲ εἴρηται (1.6). In the two explicit OT citations in the epistle of Ignatius, γέγραπται serves as introductory formula (*Eph.* 5.3; *Magn.* 12). Polycarp's epistle contains only one formula, *ut his scripturis dictum est* (*Phil.* 12.1, citing Ps. 4.5 with *Eph.* 4.26).

From this survey, it may be concluded that Clement's use of introductory formulae is not qualitatively different from that encountered in the Apostolic Fathers. The formulae common to 1 Clement, Barnabas and 2 Clement far outnumber those which are peculiar to any of the three writings. The same, indeed, may be said for the formulae used in the NT writings, although it is remarkable that several of the distinctive formulae in Clement's epistle are also found in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

C. EXACTNESS OF CITATION

Having examined the frequency of citation and the use of introductory formulae, what can we say generally about exactness or accuracy of citation? As for Clement's epistle, this subject will largely concern us in the following chapter. We may, however, anticipate our conclusions by briefly indicating that Clement's quotations vary considerably in their accuracy. On the one side, many of his quotations agree exactly (or nearly so) with the LXX; on the other side, some quotations differ greatly from the LXX. A few quotations, indeed differ so radically from LXX parallels that the question of possible alternative sources becomes acute.¹ No apparent relationship exists

¹ This subject is discussed in Chapter III below.

between the use of introductory formulae and the exactness or inexactness of citation in Clement's epistle.

The question of the exactness of OT quotations in the NT, because of its intrinsic importance, has been the subject of much examination.¹ Speaking generally, it appears that most of the quotations in the NT are derived from the LXX rather than from the Hebrew OT. Some of these quotations agree closely with the LXX; others differ quite considerably. The Gospel of Matthew is especially conspicuous in that its numerous original quotations (i.e. those not found in Mark or Luke) are non-septuagintal in text-form. Much important work has recently been done on the text-form of the quotations in Matthew, as well as that of other NT writings, with particular attention being given to the more variant quotations.² The results of these special studies cannot be summarized very readily. What can be said, however, is that the number of possible influences which can account for divergent text-forms in the quotations is large, and that the phenomena encountered in the quotations of any one writing are due to a multiplicity of factors, and thus cannot be explained under a single heading. As in Clement's epistle, there is no apparent correlation between the use of introductory formulae and the accuracy or inaccuracy of the quotations in the NT.

By way of contrast with the quotations in the NT, OT quotations in the Apostolic Fathers has remained a largely neglected subject.³

¹ Among general surveys of the OT in the NT, we mention the following: D. M. Turpie, *The OT in the New* (London, 1868); W. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876); F. Johnson, *The Quotations of the NT from the Old* (London, 1896); H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the OT in Greek* (Cambridge, 1902), pp. 381-405; B. F. C. Atkinson, "The Textual Background of the Use of the Old Testament by the New", *Journal of Transactions of the Victoria Institute* 79 (1947), 39-60; F. H. Woods, "Quotations", *HDB* IV, 184-188; L. Venard, "Citations de l'Ancien Testament dans le Nouveau Testament", *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplément II, col. 23-51.

² For Matthew's OT quotations, see especially K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew* (Uppsala, 1954); R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, Suppl. Nov. Test. XVIII (Leiden, 1967); for Luke, T. Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, TU 104 (Berlin, 1968); for the Fourth Gospel, see E. D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*, Suppl. Nov. Test. XI (Leiden, 1965); for Acts, M. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford, 1965), pp. 20-55; for Paul, E. Ellis *Paul's Use of the OT* (London, 1957); for Hebrews, K. J. Thomas, "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews", (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Manchester, 1959); S. Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam, 1961), especially pp. 13-60.

³ E. Hatch already lamented the neglect of LXX quotations in the Greek Fathers in

This fact is probably to be explained by the inherent difficulty of the subject itself and also by the uncertainty concerning LXX origins over the past several decades.¹ As we have seen, the only writings among the Apostolic Fathers which contain a substantial number of quotations are Barnabas, and 1 and 2 Clement. Apart from a few brief surveys,² and unpublished dissertations³ little work has been done on these quotations. It is clear, however, that in Barnabas and 2 Clement, as in Clement's epistle, the LXX can be quoted very freely. This is especially true of Barnabas,⁴ but free quotations are also found in 2 Clement (e.g. 6.8 [Ezk. 14.14ff.]), and Ignatius (e.g. *Tral.* 8.2 [Is. 52.5]).

If there is anything that distinguishes the manner of quotation in Clement from that of the other Apostolic Fathers, it is not the occurrence of quotations which vary considerably from the LXX, but rather the large number of quotations which agree closely with the LXX.⁵ This is doubtless connected with the presence of many long quotations—which are usually the ones most closely in agreement with the LXX—a phenomenon in which Clement is unique among the Apostolic Fathers.

In summary it may be said that in his quotation of the OT Clement stands quite manifestly in the mainstream of first and early second century Christianity, with the writers of the NT before him, and the select company of Apostolic Fathers after him. He is not without his distinctive features in this matter, such as in his frequent use of Job

1889. *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford, 1889), p. 133. Swete echoed the lament some years later. *Op. cit.*, p. 406. The lament is still applicable.

¹ See below, p. 81ff.

² E.g. in Swete, *op. cit.*, pp. 406-414; Sanday, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-37.

³ On Clement: L. A. Foster, "Clement of Rome and His Literary Sources" pp. 115-162. Foster's discussion, however, is too cursory to be satisfactory. On Barnabas: R. A. Kraft, "The Epistle of Barnabas, Its Quotations and their Sources" (Harvard Ph.D., 1961). Kraft's treatise is a thorough and excellent study of the quotations in Barnabas. Some of the fruit of this labour is now available in his recently published commentary on Barnabas and Didache. *The Apostolic Fathers III* (New York, 1965).

⁴ Cf. the indexes in Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, *AF III*, 179-185, and p. 24, n. 3 above.

⁵ In a broad survey of the nature of citation in the Christian writers of the first few centuries, W. Krause has pointed out that the Scriptures are generally cited more accurately than is pagan literature. Krause notes Clement's frequent use of direct citation, and in this connection places Clement in the lineage of the later writers Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Cyprian. *Die Stellung der Frühchristlichen Autoren zur heidnischen Literatur* (Wien, 1958), p. 128f.

and Proverbs, the use of certain introductory formulae, the exact quotations of lengthy passages, and, indeed, in the proportionate amount of space which is devoted to OT quotations. These, however, are relatively insignificant differences when seen in the light of the basic similarities with the NT and the Apostolic Fathers.

CHAPTER TWO

THE RELATION OF CLEMENT'S TEXT TO THE SEPTUAGINT

In examining the text-form of Clement's quotations, our attention shall be turned particularly to those which diverge considerably from the text of the LXX as we know it. We shall divide the quotations into four categories: (a) those which are clearly septuagintal; (b) composite quotations which are basically septuagintal; (c) quotations which appear to be (but are not necessarily) non-septuagintal; and (d) quotations which are non-canonical. Obviously, any such division as this is not absolute, and the element of personal judgement cannot be avoided.¹ Allowing for this weakness, however, the division of the material into categories has its usefulness. For our purposes, it is not necessary to reproduce the text for quotations falling into the first two categories. The variants will merely be indicated in order to ascertain, if possible, which of the main textual traditions of the LXX known to us is most like the text Clement possessed.² For the more variant quotations the text will be reproduced alongside that of the LXX so that the textual relationship may be assessed more readily.

The text of Clement used with one or two exceptions (as noted) is that of A. The variants found in C (which are most often harmonizations with the LXX) are listed in the footnotes, and where none are listed, it may be assumed by the reader that A and C are in agreement. The versions (Latin, Coptic, Syriac), which again tend to be harmonistic, are mentioned only when their evidence may help to

¹ A similar kind of classification was done by Sanday and Swete. Sanday divided the quotations into the categories "exact", "slightly variant", and "variant". *The Gospels in the Second Century*, pp. 26-29. Swete simply listed those quotations which he considered "exact or nearly exact". *An Introduction to the OT in Greek*, p. 407. The subjective character of all such judgements is seen in the fact that some of Sanday's "variant" quotations are listed by Swete as "exact or nearly exact": Cl. 4.10 (Ex. 2.14); 8.2 (Ezk. 33.11ff.); 13.1 (Je. 9.23f.); 14.4 (Pr.2.21f.); 15.2 (Is. 29.13); 18.1 (Ps. 88.21); 21.2 (Pr. 20.27); 23.5 (Is. 13.22; Mal. 3.1); 28.3 (Ps. 138.7-9); 34.6 (Is. 6.3; Dn. 7.10); 42.5 (Is. 60.17).

² For the present purpose, variant spellings, or "itacisms" are disregarded, and are not noted in the following pages.

determine a questionable reading in the Greek MSS.¹ As for the LXX, comparison is made with A, B and $\aleph$ throughout. Variants in any of the three are noted; where variants are not noted the texts agree. It is not possible within the limits imposed to list the agreements with Clement's text which may be found in later LXX MSS, particularly the cursives, as listed in Holmes and Parsons, although these MSS on occasion may perhaps witness to a text earlier than Clement. Instead, we confine ourselves to a comparison only of the major uncial MSS and the text of Clement.

A. SEPTUAGINTAL QUOTATIONS

For convenience, we subdivide this category into quotations which are essentially verbatim and those which are moderately variant.

1. *Essentially Verbatim Quotations*

Genesis

(1) Cl. 4.1-6 (Gn. 4.3-8)

The LXX of this passage differs considerably from the Hebrew, especially in verse 7. Clement, however, follows the LXX closely. When we compare the LXX text of A (the only of the three major uncial MSS which is extant for the early passages in Genesis), the following unimportant variants are seen: Clement omits $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ after $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\kappa\omega\nu$ $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\pi\rho\omicron\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$, and the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ preceding $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta$ Κάιν ἐπὶ Ἀβελ . Clement on the other hand inserts $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ after $\sigmaυνέπεσεν$ $\tau\hat{\omega}$

¹ The truth of Rahlfs' conclusions concerning the relation of the MS evidence for Clement's text to the text of the LXX (Psalms) is borne out in the present study. Rahlfs wrote "Hier sehen wir, auf wie schwankenden Boden man bei den ältesten Vätern steht. Alle Cl-Zeugen ausser Cl^A, der auch den Herausgebern des Clemensbriefes als besonders vertrauenswürdig gilt, weisen deutlich Korrekturen auf. Cl^{Achm} hat zweifellos nach seinem oberägyptischen Bibeltext, Cl^{HClem} ebenso zweifellos nach Vg [i.e. the common LXX] korrigiert, Cl^{LatSyr} nach Lat und der Peschita oder anderen Quellen. Nur Cl^A scheint eine Ausnahme zu bilden, doch kaum man solchen Erfahrungen schliesslich auch bei ihm nicht gar zu vertrauensselig sein.

Besonders stark korrigiert zeigt sich Cl^{Clem} [quotations copied by the Alexandrian Clement from the Roman Clement]. Wo überhaupt korrigiert ist, da hat Cl^{Clem} ... regelmässig die Korrektur. Das könnte bei einem so alten Zeugen auffällig scheinen, doch muss man bedenken, dass Cl^{Clem} uns nur in einer Hs. des 11. Jahrh. erhalten ist und manche Korrekturen erst durch die Abschreiber erhalten haben kann". *Septuaginta-Studien* Heft 2, "Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalters", (Göttingen, 1907), p. 202.

προσώπω,¹ and substitutes πρὸς Κδὺν for τῷ Κδὺν in verse 6. More interesting is Clement's θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ² for θυσίαν τῷ κυρίῳ and Clement's εἶπεν ὁ θεός for εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεός.³ A final variant is found in Clement's ἐλυπήθη Κδὺν for the LXX's ἐλύπησεν τὸν Κδὺν. The rest of this long quotation is in verbatim agreement with A.

(2) Cl. 6.3 (Gn. 2.23)

This short quotation agrees exactly with the LXX as found in A (where, however, ὁστούν seems to have been inadvertently omitted in the original hand).

(3) Cl. 10.3 (Gn. 12.1-3)

These words are in verbatim agreement with the LXX (A) with the exception of three slight variants: Clement reads ἄπελθε for ἔξελθε, εὐλογημένος for the LXX εὐλογητός, and has transposed καταράσσομαι and τοὺς καταρωμένους σε.⁴

(4) Cl. 10.4f. (Gn. 13.14-16)

Again a verbatim quotation from the LXX (A) except for a few unimportant variants: the omission of καί before ἰδε, and τοῦ before αἰῶνος;⁵ and the divergent verb-forms ἀναβλέψας for ἀναβλέψον, and the final ἐξαριθμηθήσεται for ἀριθμηθήσεται.

(5) Cl. 17.2 (Gn. 18.27)

This short quotation agrees exactly with the LXX (A).

(6) Cl. 33.5 (Gn. 1.26f.)

Apart from abridging the Genesis passage by omitting the reference to man's dominion over the other living creatures and the repetitive clause κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, Clement cites the passage exactly, with but one insignificant divergence from the LXX (A):

¹ Lightfoot calls attention to the awkwardness of the dative, which he attributes to "a very early transcriber's error in the LXX". I, 2, 22. In C τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ has replaced the dative. That Clement kept the awkward dative may argue for the accuracy with which he copied the quotation.

² Clement's text as found in C reads κυρίῳ, perhaps by harmonization with LXX. The Latin supports C, but the Coptic and Syriac support A. For θεῷ, see Heb. 11.4. Cf. E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 152.

³ Grant says that Clement "twice omits 'Lord' from the expression 'Lord God,' perhaps because of Hellenistic influence". *AF* II, 24. This is not quite accurate since in one instance ὁ θεός replaces the simple κύριος, not κύριος ὁ θεός. It is difficult to know whether these slight variants are due to Hellenistic influence.

⁴ The first part of this quotation is also found in Acts 7.3, where however, the words καὶ δεῦρο are inserted after συγγενείας σου, and the phrase καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου omitted. For a fuller discussion of the quotation, including the evidence afforded by Philo, see E. Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

⁵ C, however, inserts τοῦ, perhaps by way of harmonization with the LXX.

the displacement of *ἡμετέραν* from after *εἰκόνα* to after *ὁμοίωσαν* (this same displacement is found in Barnabas [5.5] and later Fathers).¹

(7) Cl. 33.6 (Gn. 1.28)

This quotation, which is a continuation of the quotation just examined, consists of the three words *αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε* exactly as found in the LXX (A).

Exodus

(8) Cl. 4.10 (Ex. 2.14)

Clement's quotation agrees exactly with LXX (B) except for the important variant *κριτὴν ἢ δικαστήν* for *ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν*.² This may possibly be the result of the influence of Lk. 12.14, *κριτὴν ἢ μεριστήν* in an allusion to the present passage, especially since there is no LXX support of any kind for *κριτήν*.³ There is a further divergence from the A MS of the LXX which reads *τὸν Αἰγύπτιον* *χθές* for B's (and Clement's) *ἐχθές τὸν Αἰγύπτιον*.⁴

Deuteronomy

(9) Cl. 29.2 (Dt. 32.8f.)

This quotation agrees exactly with the LXX (A and B) except for the omission of *καὶ* before *ἐγενήθη*.

(10) Cl. 53.2f. (Dt. 9.12-14)

An exact quotation, but for the following variants: *Μωϋσῆ, Μωϋσῆ*—which is lacking in the LXX and which Clement has apparently imported from Ex. 3.4;⁵ *χωνεύματα* (LXX: *χώνευμα*, B; *χώνευτα*,

¹ Hatch says that the changed position of the pronoun *ἡμετέραν* found in the various witnesses "can hardly be ascribed to accident or inexact quotation". The position of the pronoun was later considered important in Gnostic controversies (cf. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 23, 1, 5). Hatch adds that the variation of the position of the pronoun points to "the existence of well-established readings outside the existing MSS of the LXX" and also "the small influence which early patristic citations exercised upon MSS of the LXX". *Op. cit.*, p. 143.

² The reading of C and all the versions, however, is apparently harmonized to agree with the LXX MSS. The Latin, although having *principem* with the LXX, supports the *ἦ* of A, reading *aut*.

³ See below, p. 175. The quotation also occurs in Acts 7.27 (cf. 7.35); however, it agrees precisely with the LXX as found in B. Cf. Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 169f.

⁴ Hatch writes "That both the Acts and Clement are quoting the LXX is shown by their use of *ἐχθές*, which word is not in the Hebrew". *Ibid.*, p. 170.

⁵ The first part of this same quotation occurs twice in Barnabas in a slightly more divergent form, but in both places is introduced with the repetition *Μωϋσῆ, Μωϋσῆ*

A); the adjusted pronoun in *πρὸς αὐτόν* for the LXX *πρὸς με*; the omission of the LXX's *λαός* after *ἰδοῦ*; the displacement of *ἐστίν*; the substitution of *θαυμαστόν* for *ἰσχυρόν*. In two minor points, the omission of *καί* before *ἐποίησαν*, and the omission of *καὶ νῦν* before *ἔασόν με*, Clement sides with A against B. A, however, diverges from Clement in reading *πολὺ καὶ ἰσχυρόν* for *θαυμαστόν καὶ πολὺ*.¹

Job

(11) Cl. 30.4f. (Job 11.2f)

A verbatim quotation from the LXX (B) except for the omission of *καί* before *ὁ ἐύλαλος*. In the LXX, A differs from B only in two slight and unimportant transpositions. Clement thus faithfully follows the LXX although its meaning is rather obscure, and despite the fact that it differs in great extent from the Hebrew.²

(12) Cl. 56.6-15 (Job 5.17-26)

This long quotation is given in essentially verbatim agreement with the LXX. Clement's text agrees with B, but for the following variants: omission of first *δέ*; transposition of the two words *ἐξελεῖται σε*; *οὐκ* for *οὐ μὴ* before *ᾄψεται*; in its first occurrence, *φοβηθήσῃ* for *φοβηθήσῃς*; omission of the following *ἀπό*; *ἐπερχομένων* for *ἐρχομένων*; and omission of *ἔσται* before *παμβότανον*. Although a few of these variants are found in LXX A (*ἐξελεῖται σε*; *οὐχ ᾄψεται*; *φοβηθήσῃ*) the number of other small differences between A and Clement's text is much larger, although not particularly significant. Beyond this, in the middle of the LXX passage there is an insertion of two clauses in A which are lacking in B and *κ*.³ The text of Clement's quotation is thus nearer to B and *κ* than to A.⁴

(Barn. 4.8; 14.3). Lightfoot rightly denies Hilgenfeld's contention that this is the result of the dependence of one author on the other. I, 2, 157. The words may have been 'inserted independently' from Ex. 3.4 as Lightfoot suggests, or may, because of their suitability to the passage, have been traditionally inserted. Grant notes the presence of the repeated name and adds "doubtless reflecting a Septuagint text used by early Christians". *AF* II, 85.

¹ The second part of the quotation (beginning with *λεάληκα*) is found also in Clement of Alexandria where it agrees exactly with the text of the Roman Clement. (*Stromata* IV, 118, 2).

² Cf. Lightfoot I, 2, 96f.

³ In addition to these two clauses (*καὶ οὐ φοβηθήσῃ ἀπὸ τάλαιπωρίας, ὅτι ἐλεύσεται τάλαιπωρία*) which are not to be found in the Hebrew, there are added in A, after verse 23 (LXX), four clauses found in the Hebrew, but lacking in B and *κ*. Cf. Lightfoot I, 2, 165.

⁴ Contra Foster who wrongly asserts "the text of 1 Clement regularly follows the Alexandrine readings in this quotation". *Op. cit.*, p. 136.

Psalms

(13) Cl. 15.3 (Ps. 61.5)

A brief quotation in which Clement agrees exactly with the LXX (B and $\aleph$; A, deficient) except for the substitution of the post-positive δέ for καί as the connective of the two clauses.¹

(14) Cl. 15.4 (Ps. 77.36f.)

Except for the omission of ἐν before τῷ στόματι and αὐτῷ for αὐτόν after ἐψεύσαντο, the quotation is in verbatim agreement with the LXX (B and $\aleph$; A, deficient).² Clement thus supports the ἡγάπησαν of the LXX MSS rather than the reading ἡπάτησαν which is accepted by Rahlfs.³

(15) Cl. 15.5 (Ps. 30.19)

The ending of this short quotation together with the beginning of the following quotation appears to have been lost in both Greek MSS by homoeoteleuton, and is preserved only in the Syriac version of the epistle.⁴ The omitted portion is here set in brackets :

ἄλλα γενηθήτω τὰ χεῖλη τὰ δόλια
[τὰ λαλοῦντα κατὰ τοῦ δικαίου ἁνομίαν · καὶ πάλιν
ἐξολεθρεύσαι κύριος πάντα τὰ χεῖλη τὰ δόλια]
γλῶσσαν μεγαλορήμονα κτλ.

¹ Clement's text as found in C reads εὐλογοῦν. The quotation, dependent on Clement of Rome, is found in Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 32, 4) where the verb is further altered to εὐλογοῦσι (cf. also καταρῶνται for κατηρῶντο). Rahlfs explains the changes as due to "der nicht mehr verstandenen Imperfektform εὐλογοῦσαν". *Septuaginta-Studien* II, 201. Knopf writes "die Endung -σαν statt -ν dringt in der Koine vor". *Die Apostolischen Väter* I, Ergänzungsband, HZNT, p. 67. Cf. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the OT in Greek* (Cambridge, 1909), p. 214.

² C reads ἐψεξαν for ἐψεύσαντο. Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 32, 5) borrowing the quotation from the Roman Clement agrees with A except for the insertion of ἐν before στόματι with the LXX.

³ See Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* II (Stuttgart, 1935), p. 36; cf. *Psalmi cum Odis*, Septuaginta Societatis Scientiarum Göttingensis X (Göttingen, 1931), p. 215. In the latter, Rahlfs only indicates Grabe and the MT as favouring the reading. Lightfoot agrees that this was probably the original reading of the LXX. I, 2, 55.

⁴ Thus behind A, C, the Latin and both Coptic versions, apparently lies a Greek MS which contained the error. Knopf writes "Der Grundfehler, die Auslassung, muss aber sehr alt sein". *Op. cit.*, p. 67. It is not impossible that Clement's LXX MS of the Psalms had omitted the words by homoeoteleuton. It should be noted that the omission also occurs in Clement of Alexandria's quotation of the Roman Clement. (*Stromata* IV, 33, 1). See Stählin's edition, II, 262. That Clement of Alexandria has borrowed these OT quotations from the Roman Clement is clearly evident from the fact that immediately follow-

The first six words of the quotation which alone remain in the Greek MSS, agree exactly with the LXX (A and $\aleph$; against B, which reads *γενηθήτωσαν*).¹ The Syriac gives reason to expect that the remainder of the quotation was also in close agreement with the LXX.

(16) Cl. 15.5-6 (Ps. 11.4-6)

Apart from the beginning of this quotation, which as we have just indicated is lacking in the Greek MSS as a result of homoeoteleuton, the agreement with the LXX according to B and $\aleph$ (before the alterations to the latter MS in the seventh century) is verbatim (but Clement has *παρ' ἡμῖν* for *παρ' ἡμῶν*).² The LXX of A differs slightly in two further places. The first part of the quotation in Clement according to C differs somewhat by making certain changes (*μεγαλορήμονα* to *μεγαλορήμων*, and then inserting the words *καὶ πάλιν*) to correct the ungrammatical sentence left by the homoeoteleuton.³

(17) Cl. 16.15f. (Ps. 21.7-9)

This quotation is in verbatim agreement with the LXX (B) except for Clement's plural *ἀνθρώπων* for *ἀνθρώπου*.⁴ A slight additional difference is found in LXX A (*οὐχί* for Clement's *οὐκ*). In the variant *ἀνθρώπου* Clement agrees with $\aleph$, which, however, differs from Clement by inserting *καὶ* before *ἐλάλησαν*.

(18) Cl. 18.2-17 (Ps. 50.3-19)

In this very long citation⁵—the longest in the epistle—Clement reproduces the LXX (B and $\aleph$; A, deficient) word for word except for two insignificant transpositions.⁶ Clement thus reads *ἀσεβείς ἐπισ-*

ing the quotation he continues with Clement's following sentence (16.1), given in verbatim agreement *ταπεινοφρονούντων γάρ ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός οὐκ ἐπαιρομένων ἐπὶ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ*. Stählin fails to call attention to this fact.

¹ Clement according to C reads *γενηθείη*.

² C however reads *παρ' ἡμῶν* probably by way of correction with the LXX.

³ Cf. Lightfoot I, 2, 56. Hatch, on the other hand, is skeptical of the supposition of homoeoteleuton, which he says "destroys the parallelism", and prefers the reading of C, which begins a separate quotation with the words *τοὺς εἰπόντας*. This view is connected with Hatch's belief that the series of quotations form a single cento. See below, p. 98.

⁴ Clement C omits *δέ* at the beginning of the citation.

⁵ Clement C contains only the opening clauses of the quotation, omitting the remainder either as irrelevant or to save space. The first part of the quotation (but more than in Clement according to C) is also found in Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 107, 2ff.), the text of which, apart from an insertion, agrees with that of Clement.

⁶ Clement reads *νικήσεις* for the LXX *νικήσης*, but Lightfoot regards this as a spelling variant, rather than a genuine variant in tense. I, 2, 66. The Coptic MSS contain the addition *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ξύλου* after *ὁσώπω* in Cl. 18.7. Rahlfs characterizes this as an "oberägyptische Lesart". *Septuaginta-Studien* II, 200.

τρέψουσιν ἐπὶ σε for ἀσεβεῖς ἐπὶ σε ἐπιστρέψουσιν, and τὸ στόμα μου ἀνοίξεις, καὶ τὰ χεῖλη μου ἀναγγελεῖ for τὰ χεῖλη μου ἀνοίξεις, καὶ τὸ στόμα μου ἀναγγελεῖ.¹

(19) Cl. 22.1-7 (Ps 33.12-18)

A long quotation, agreeing closely with the LXX.² There are the slight disagreements with the LXX of A, B and κ: πρὸς δέησιν for εἰς δέησιν; ὁ δίκαιος for οἱ δίκαιοι (and the corresponding singular verb ἐκέκραξεν, and pronouns αὐτοῦ and αὐτόν for the plural which follow). In one slight divergence, Clement agrees with A and κ against B (the transposition ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν ἀγαθὰς for ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς). Clement also agrees with A, against B and κ, in the omission of ὅτι before ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου. On the other hand, Clement differs from A in omitting σου after χεῖλη.³ In the Syriac version of Clement's epistle the words of Ps. 33.20 are found attached to the present quotation. The Greek equivalent is given by Lightfoot as follows: πολλαὶ αἱ θλίψεις τοῦ δικαίου καὶ ἐκ πασῶν ῥύσεται αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος.⁴ Lightfoot has argued that these words were in the original text of Clement, but dropped out of the Greek MSS owing to the fact that the following citation (Cl. 22.8) also begins with the words πολλαὶ αἱ.⁵ This suggestion, however, cannot be regarded as a certainty.⁶

¹ The versions, however, agree with the LXX rather than with the transpositions found in Clement A. In the second transposition, however, the Coptic supports the reading of Clement A.

² Clement C contains only the first eight words of the citation, omitting the larger part as in the previous citation. Clement of Alexandria quotes the citation in exact agreement with Clement of Rome except for two not inconsiderable insertions, and the omission of ὁ δίκαιος as well as two pronouns near the end of the citation (*Stromata* IV, 109, 1f.).

³ There is an error in Swete's indication that χεῖλη τοῦ is supported by κ^c.a.AB. The latter witnesses support the reading χεῖλη σου. *An Introduction to the OT in Greek*, p. 407; cf. Swete's *The OT in Greek*, II (Cambridge, 1891), p. 253.

⁴ This agrees with the LXX of A against B and κ in the inclusion of the final words ὁ κύριος. Elsewhere Clement agrees with the LXX (A, B and κ) except for the omission of αὐτῶν after πασῶν, and the singular δικαίου (and αὐτοῦ) for the plural forms. The plural δικαίων is supported by the quotation of the passage in 4 Macc. 18.16, but the singular agrees with the MT.

⁵ Lightfoot I, 2, 79. Harnack agrees with Lightfoot, calling the omission "ein leicht verständliches Versehen". *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 111.

⁶ Knopf writes that the Syriac is to be followed "kaum mit Recht" against all the remaining witnesses. *Op. cit.*, p. 85. Cf. Grant, *AF* II, 47. It may be added that Clement of Alexandria follows A in omitting the words in question. (*Stromata* IV, 109, 3). On the other hand, if the Syriac is trusted in Cl. 15.5 (see above) perhaps it is also to be trusted in the present instance.

(20) Cl. 22.8 (Ps. 31.10)

Attached directly to the preceding quotation, this short quotation agrees exactly with the LXX (A, B and $\aleph$) but for the plural $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ἐλπίζοντας instead of the singular $\tau\omicron\nu\upsilon$ ἐλπίζοντα.¹

(21) Cl. 27.7 (Ps. 18.2-4)

This quotation agrees exactly with the LXX, having only the following variants.² Against A, B and $\aleph$, Clement transposes $\lambda\alpha\lambda\iota\alpha\iota$ οὐδὲ λόγοι to $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota$ οὐδὲ $\lambda\alpha\lambda\iota\alpha\iota$ and inserts $\kappa\alpha\iota$ before οὐκ εἰσὶν $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota$.³ With B and $\aleph$, against A, Clement twice reads ἀναγγέλλει for ἀναγγελεῖ and includes the final αὐτῶν omitted by A*. With A and $\aleph$, against B, Clement inserts the definite article ἡ before ἡμέρα.

(22) Cl. 35.7-12 (Ps. 49.16-23)

In this lengthy quotation there are few variants from the text of the LXX.⁴ The most striking of these is found in the words ὥς λέων which are added to μήποτε ἀρπάσῃ and which are lacking in the major uncial MSS of the LXX and in the MT.⁵ Clement also inserts σε in the clause παραστήσω σε κατὰ πρόσωπόν σου.⁶ Apart from these insertions, there are only the following insignificant variants: ἐπὶ στόματός μου for διὰ στόματός σου (A, B and $\aleph$);⁷ ἄνομε for ἀνομίαν (with $\aleph$ *, against B; A, deficient);⁸ and ὁδὸς ἧν δείξω for ὁδὸς ἧ δείξω (against B and $\aleph$; A, deficient).⁹ Codex A of the LXX breaks off in

¹ C has the singular, probably by way of harmonization with the LXX. The quotation is borrowed by Clement of Alexandria, who supports Clement's plural. (*Stromata* IV, 110, 1).

² C contains only the first verse of the citation, picking up the words ἀκούονται αἱ φωναί at the end of the citation.

³ Lightfoot suggests that like the initial εἰ Clement's inserted $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is perhaps not to be regarded as a part of the quotation. I, 2, 91.

⁴ In its customary manner, C abbreviates the quotation considerably, proceeding from διὰ στόματος μου to θυσία αἰνέσεως δοξάσει με, tying the portions together with the words $\kappa\alpha\iota$ ἐν τῷ τέλει.

⁵ The added words are found in R (the sixth century 'Verona Psalter'), some Latin MSS and a Syriac MS associated with Theodoret. See Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien* II, 200. Lightfoot says that the words "must have come from Ps. 7.3 either as a gloss in Clement's text of the LXX or as inadvertently inserted by him in a quotation made from memory". I, 2, 110.

⁶ Rahlfs notes the agreement of this reading with certain Egyptian and Western text-types of the Psalms. See *Septuaginta-Studien* II, 199.

⁷ C, however, conforms to the LXX reading.

⁸ Clement according to A reads ἄνομαι, but the first hand of the Syriac supports ἄνομε rather than ἀνομίαν; C is lacking. See the long note in Lightfoot I, 2, 110.

⁹ Lightfoot regards ἧν as a corruption in A, and restores ἧ to the text. *Ibid.*

the middle of the present passage, but in the part which remains differs from Clement in having *ἵνα τί σὺ ἐκδιηγῇ* for *ἵνα τί σὺ διηγῇ*,¹ and in having *ἐξέβαλος* (κ, ἐξέβαλες). Elsewhere Clement's agreement with LXX B is striking.

(23) Cl. 36.3 (Ps. 103.4)

An exact quotation from the LXX (A, B and κ) except for the final two words where Clement has *πυρός φλόγα* for *πῦρ φλέγον*.² Clement's reading, however, agrees with, and is probably to be explained by, Heb. 1.7.³

(24) Cl. 36.4 (Ps. 2.7f.)

A verbatim quotation of the LXX agreeing with B, κ and A (the latter containing two variant spellings). The first part of the quotation occurs in Acts 13.33 and Heb. 1.5 with exactly the same text-form.

(25) Cl. 36.5 (Ps. 109.1)

Again the quotation agrees with the LXX (A and κ; B, deficient) word for word. The same quotation is found in Heb. 1.3 in exactly the same form and also in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt. 22.44f; Mk. 12.36; Lk. 20.42f.), where however, the opening words *εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου* are included, and Matthew and Mark have *ὑποκάτω* for *ὑποπόδιον*.

(26) Cl. 46.3 (Ps. 17.26f.)

This quotation agrees verbatim with the LXX (A, B and κ).⁴

(27) Cl. 48.2f. (Ps. 117.19f.)

A quotation in verbatim agreement with the LXX (A and κ; B, deficient) except for the subjunctive *ἐξομολογήσωμαι* for the indicative *ἐξομολογήσομαι*.⁵

¹ C at this point agrees with A of the LXX against B.

² C has *φλόγα πυρός*, perhaps by influence from Rev. 2.18. The LXX according to A reads *πυρός φλέγα*, a reading which, Lighfoot says, reflects "a transition state". I, 2, 112.

³ For this and the following two quotations, see below, p. 179ff.

⁴ This quotation also appears verbatim in Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* V, 52, 3f.).

⁵ C, however, corrects the verb to agree with the LXX. The quotation is taken up in two places by Clement of Alexandria. In one place he supports the reading of C (*Stromata* VI, 64, 2); in the other place he supports the reading of A, but inserts *ἵνα* to accompany the subjunctive (*Stromata* I, 38, 5). In the former passage he continues with words from Clement's epistle but mistakenly ascribes them to Barnabas. Cf. Lighfoot I, 2, 146.

(28) Cl. 50.6 (Ps. 31.1f.)

In exact word for word agreement with the LXX (A, B and $\aleph^*$). The quotation is also given exactly in Clement of Alexandria and in Rom. 4.7ff.¹

(29) Cl. 52.3 (Ps. 49.14f.)

The quotation is in verbatim agreement with the LXX (A) and differs from B and $\aleph^*$ only in the insertion of σου after θλίψεως.²

(30) Cl. 52.4 (Ps. 50.19)

This short quotation which is added directly to the preceding one agrees exactly with the LXX (B and $\aleph$; A, deficient).³

(31) Cl. 54.3 (Ps. 23.1)

A very short quotation which agrees word for word with the LXX (A, B and $\aleph$).

(32) Cl. 56.3 (Ps. 117.18)

A short quotation in verbatim agreement with the LXX (A; B, deficient). $\aleph$ has the slight difference of omitting the article before κύριος.

(33) Cl. 56.5 (Ps. 140.5)

Apart from Clement's γάρ at the beginning of the citation, the only differences from the LXX (A, B and $\aleph$) are ἔλαιος for ἔλαιον⁴ and ἀμαρτωλῶν for ἀμαρτωλοῦ.⁵ There is one slight additional divergence in $\aleph$ which omits δέ after ἔλαιον.

Proverbs

(34) Cl. 30.2 (Pr. 3.34)

This quotation agrees exactly with the LXX (A, B and $\aleph$) except

¹ Clement of Alexandria, however, reads ἀνὴρ ᾧ οὐ μὴ λογίσῃται for ἀνὴρ οὗ οὐ μὴ λογίσῃται (*Stromata* II, 65, 2). This same variant occurs in Clement of Rome according to C. In Rom. 4.8 the variant ᾧ for οὗ is generally regarded as inferior although it is supported by A, C and the MSS of the Textus Receptus.

² C omits the second half of the quotation and thus provides no evidence concerning the σου. The quotation is, however, found in Clement of Alexandria where σου is present, but τῷ κυρίῳ is substituted for τῷ ὑψίστῳ (*Stromata* IV, 113, 3).

³ Thus also Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 113, 3).

⁴ Clement's ἔλαιος, found in A, is a variant spelling of ἔλεος. This reading is probably the result of the preceding ἐν ἐλέει, and Lightfoot mentions that it is "not impossible that Clement found this reading in his text of the LXX". I, 2, 164. C reads ἔλεον, a variant spelling of the LXX's ἔλαιον. The Syriac, Latin and Coptic MSS support the reading ἔλαιον.

⁵ Lightfoot does not mention this variant from the LXX text. C has the singular

in one insignificant variant, the substitution of *θεός γάρ* for *κύριος*. In this variant, Clement agrees with the quotation as found in 1 Pet. 5.5 and Jas. 4.6, and has probably been influenced by the one or the other.¹

(35) Cl. 56.4 (Pr. 3.12)

This brief quotation as found in Clement agrees exactly with the LXX of A and *κ*. A variant occurs in LXX B, which reads *ἐλέγχει* for the *παιδεύει* of the other witnesses. The quotation also occurs in Heb. 12.6 where it agrees exactly with the text of Clement.²

(36) Cl. 57.3-7 (Pr. 1.23-33)

In this long quotation the agreement with the LXX is striking. Perhaps the most significant difference is Clement's omission of the words *ἢ ὅταν ἔρχεται ὑμῖν ὁλεθρος* which are found in the major uncial MSS of the LXX A, B and *κ*, and are omitted only by C in the LXX.³ Another variant in Clement, against A, B and *κ** of the LXX, is *τὸν δὲ φόβον τοῦ κυρίου* for *τὸν δὲ λόγον τοῦ κυρίου*, a variant which again, interestingly, agrees with the Ephraem Codex (C)⁴ as well as *κ*^{c.a.} Remaining variants are slight: *τὰς ἐμὰς βουλὰς* for *ἐμὰς βουλὰς* and *ὁμοία* for *ὁμοίως* against all the LXX witnesses; *ὑπηκούσατε*, with B, against A and *κ*, which read *ὑπηκούετε*; *ἡπειθήσατε*, with B, against A and *κ** which read *οὐ προσείχετε*; *ἐμίσησαν γὰρ σοφίαν* with B, against A which reads *ἐμίσησαν γὰρ παιδίαν*; *τοῦ κυρίου* (Pr. 1.29) with B, against A which reads *κυρίου*; *ἡνίκα ἂν* with B against *κ* which reads *ἐάν*; *ἢ ὅταν* with A, against B (and C) which reads *καὶ ὅταν*. For the last part of the citation, C is the only Greek witness to the text of Clement since after the verb *πλησθίσοντα* the following leaf of the A MS is no longer extant and A resumes only in chapter 64. In this portion C agrees exactly with the LXX witnesses, as we may believe A also to have done.⁵ The variants

ἁμαρτωλοῦ by way of harmonization. C further differs from the A MS of Clement by reading *κύριος* for *δίκαιος*, but is alone in so doing.

¹ See below, p. 241ff.

² Lightfoot is of the opinion that *ἐλέγχει* was the original LXX reading, and notes that the *παιδεύει* "may perhaps have been derived directly or indirectly from the quotation in the Epistle to the Hebrews". I, 2, 164.

³ The clause is omitted in all the witnesses to Clement's text.

⁴ The reading of Ephraem here, like that of Clement's source, reflects a correction in line with the Hebrew text. See below, p. 85.

⁵ At one point, however, C may have omitted a word, *πεποιθώς* (after *ἐλπίδι*), which is found in Latin, Syriac, and Coptic versions. This word seems to have been taken

between Clement's text and that of the LXX do not consistently favour any single LXX MS, but in different places favour B, C or A.

Isaiah

(37) Cl. 8.4 (Is. 1.16-20)

This long quotation is in remarkably exact agreement with the LXX MSS. The variants are few and insignificant: against the LXX MSS, Clement inserts *καί* after *λούσασθε*, has *ἀφέλεσθε* for *ἀφέλετε*, and omits *κύριος* after *διελεγχθῶμεν λέγει*.¹ Clement has *καί* before *διελεγχθῶμεν* with A and *κ*, against B; and *χίρα* with B, against A and *κ*.² A considerable number of unimportant spelling variants arise from the employment of *-αι* for *-ε* in the A MS of Clement. Again, despite the close agreement with the LXX MSS, no one particular MS is favoured above others.³

(38) Cl. 13.4 (Is. 66.2)

A short quotation which agrees with the LXX (A, B and *κ*) except for the following variants: Clement has *πραῦν* for *ταπεινόν*,⁴ and has *μου τὰ λόγια* for *τοὺς λόγους μου*.⁵

(39) Cl. 16.3-14 (Is. 53)

In this, one of the longest quotations in Clement's epistle, the agreement with the LXX is very close. In only five places do variants occur which diverge from the main LXX MSS (A, B and *κ*). These are: *τὸ εἶδος τῶν ἀνθρώπων* for *τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων* (B), *πάντας ἀνθρώπους* (A), *πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων* (*κ*), in Is. 53.3;⁶

up by Clement in the opening words of the following chapter. Thus Lightfoot I, 2, 168, followed by Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 135f., and Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 119. If this is the case, then A may have contained another variant from the LXX MSS since the word is lacking in the latter, and the reading of C may be accounted for by harmonization. Earlier, C differs from A by inserting the words *καὶ στενοχωρία* before *καὶ πολιορκία* (cf. Rom. 2.9 and 8.35 where *θλίψις* is also linked with *στενοχωρία*).

¹ C appears to have harmonized with the LXX in all three places.

² C, however, reads *χίραν* with A and *κ*.

³ Lightfoot calls attention to the presence of this quotation with readings occasionally similar to those of Clement, in several passages in Justin Martyr. I, 2, 41. Cf. also Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

⁴ Knopf points out that the LXX reading *ταπεινόν* would have suited Clement's own *ταπεινοφρονοῦντες* which immediately precedes the citation. *Op. cit.*, p. 65.

⁵ The reading of C *μου τοὺς λόγους* stands between A and the LXX.

⁶ Hatch indicates that none of these translations corresponds to the Hebrew text. A corresponding Hebrew text is, however, found in Is. 52.14, and Hatch suggests "the hypothesis that the Greek of this verse, whichever of the two translations be adopted, represents an alternative, but now lost, Hebrew text". *Op. cit.*, p. 179.

immediately following, the insertion of καὶ πόνῳ after the words ἐν πληγῇ ὧν against all the LXX witnesses;¹ the substitution of ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν for ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν in 53.6, against the LXX witnesses; ἦκει for ἦχθη in 53.8 against the LXX witnesses;² and the omission of ἐν before τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη in 53.12 against the LXX witnesses.³ In the variants which remain, Clement is supported by at least one or two of the main LXX MSS. Thus, with A and κ Clement reads ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον,⁴ against B's ὡς παιδίον ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ (53.2); with A and B, Clement reads οὐδέ, against κ's οὐτε (53.2); ἐκλείπον with A and B, against κ's ἐκλείποντα; αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν πόνῳ with A and B, against αὐτὸν ἐν πόνοις of κ* (53.4); ἁμαρτίας ... ἀνομίας with B, against ἀνομίας ... ἁμαρτίας of A and κ (53.5);⁵ μεμαλάκισται with B and κ, against ἐμαλακίσθη of A (53.5); κεκακῶσθαι with A and B, against κεκραγῶσθαι of κ* (53.7); κείραντος with A (which, however, also adds αὐτόν, lacking in Clement), against κείροντος of B and κ* (53.7); ἦρθη with A and B, against ἦχθη of κ* (53.8); the addition of αὐτοῦ after τοῦ θανάτου with A and κ, against B (53.9); οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος with A and κ*, against οὐδὲ δόλον of B (53.9); αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς with B and κ, against αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς πληγῆς of A (53.10); ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν with A and κ, against ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν of B (53.10); κύριος βούλεται with A and κ*, against βούλεται κύριος of B (53.10); and διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας with A, against διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας of B and κ (53.12). Compared to the length of the quotation, these variants are few and insignificant. Clement thus agrees almost exactly with the LXX⁶ in a passage which diverges from the MT considerably. Among the variants within the main LXX MSS, Clement fails to consistently favour any of the

¹ Lightfoot accounts for this variant in Clement's text "either by a lapse of memory on Clement's part or by an error in his copy of the LXX or in the transcription of Clement's own text". I, 2, 59.

² For further evidence, and agreement with Justin Martyr, see Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

³ In all of these variants, except the last, C supports the reading of the A MS of Clement's epistle, rather than the LXX MSS. Cf. Hatch for further witnesses which agree with Clement's variants, *op. cit.*, p. 178f.

⁴ Cf. Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 201f. for further evidence, and particularly the agreement with Justin Martyr.

⁵ Clement according to C agrees instead with A and κ.

⁶ Knopf writes: "Das lange Zitat ist selbstverständlich nicht nach dem Gedächtnis gegeben, sondern aufgeschlagen und aufgeschrieben worden, stimmt daher recht genau mit unseren LXX Handschriften überein". *Op. cit.*, p. 69.

three witnesses (the most that may be said is that variants from the text of A are fewest [3]).

2. *Moderately Variant Quotations*

In this section we include quotations in which the variations are somewhat more extensive or intrinsically significant than those already examined. Nonetheless, in these quotations the exactness of agreement with the LXX still remains conspicuous.

Genesis

(1) Cl. 10.6 (Gn. 15.5f.)

The beginning of this quotation has been purposefully changed to identify the speaker and the object of the verb. Thus for the LXX (A and D; B and $\aleph$, deficient) which reads ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτόν, Clement writes ἐξήγαγεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ἀβραάμ.¹ Further variants from the LXX are: the omission of the immediately following ἔξω; εἶπεν αὐτῷ for εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν; the omission of the following δὴ; εἰ δυνήσῃ for εἰ δύνῃ; the omission of καὶ εἶπεν before οὕτως ἔσται; and ἐπίστευσεν δέ for καὶ ἐπίστευσεν.² Whether quoting from memory or the written text, Clement appears to have adapted the material for his own purpose.³

Exodus

(2) Cl. 53.4 (Ex. 32.32)

In this quotation Clement gives the substance of the LXX passage, but departs from its syntax—which here consists of two conditional sentences—substituting instead two clauses joined by ἥ.⁴

Cl: μηθαμῶς, κύριε · ἄφες τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ

LXX: (B and A; $\aleph$, deficient) εἰ μὲν ἀφείς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν omitted by A), ἄφες.

Cl: ἥ καμὲ ἐξάλειψον ἐκ βίβλου ζώντων.

LXX: εἰ δὲ μή: ἐξάλειψόν με ἐκ τῆς βίβλου σου, ἥς ἔγραψας.

¹ C, in contrast to A, preserves the δέ of the LXX.

² In this variant Clement agrees with the quotation as found in Rom. 4.3, against the LXX witnesses. See below, p. 218f.

³ Grant says that the passage is given "with a few omissions for the sake of Greek style". *AF* II, 52.

⁴ The quotation is again borrowed by Clement of Alexandria where it agrees verbatim with the Roman Clement (*Stromata* IV, 118, 3).

It can be seen that while Clement's quotation is close to the LXX, it is rather freely given, having been tacked on to the preceding quotation in the epistle, quite possibly from memory. Alternatively, Clement may be purposefully abbreviating the text before him.¹

Job

(3) Cl. 17.3 (Job. 1.1)

Despite the fact that Clement mentions Job in the introductory formula (περὶ Ἰὼβ οὕτως γέγραπται), he alters the opening words of the quotation to Ἰὼβ δὲ ἦν for the LXX's (A, B and $\aleph$) καὶ ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος. The order of the following four adjectives is also altered: in Clement, δίκαιος καὶ ἄμεμπτος, ἀληθινός, θεοσεβής; the LXX omits καὶ and gives the order 3214 (B and $\aleph$) or 2134 (A). For Clement's final words, παντὸς κακοῦ, the LXX MSS read παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος.²

(4) Cl. 17.4 (Job 14.4f.)

This is a short quotation which resembles the LXX text and yet differs in the following respects. Clement turns the question and answer of the LXX into an indicative sentence, substituting οὐδεὶς for the opening τίς γάρ of the LXX and also omitting the verb ἔσται. In the second half of the quotation, Clement reads οὐδ' ἂν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ for the LXX's (B) ἀλλ' οὐθείς ἐὰν καὶ μία ἡμέρα ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (A differs in having οὐδὲ εἰς [$\aleph$, ουδεὶς] and μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ γένηται).³ The quotation is unquestionably related to the LXX text, but seems to have been freely rendered.⁴

(5) Cl. 26.3 (Job 19.26)

In this brief quotation the texts may be juxtaposed to display the differences.

¹ Cf. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 130. Grant suggests that Clement purposefully employs *μῆδαμῶς* "to emphasize Moses' boldness". For the *βίβλου ζώντων* Grant refers to Ps. 68.29 and the twelfth of the Eighteen Benedictions, which he claims Clement may have known. *AF* II, 85.

² The quotation in exactly the same form is found in *Stromata* IV, 105, 1, where, however, the Alexandrian Clement borrows from his Roman namesake.

³ Again the quotation is found in Clement of Alexandria who differs from Clement in having οὐδεὶς μία ἡμέρα. The οὐδ' ἂν of the Roman Clement, however, is found only in C, A being deficient, so that the Alexandrian may witness to the correct reading. The text οὐδ' ἂν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ which Lightfoot prints in his edition has an additional *η* which the MSS do not contain and which he does not justify. I, 2, 63f.

⁴ Knopf says of this and the preceding citation (Job 1.1.) "die beiden Zitate bei I Clem. sind nicht wörtlich übernommen, sondern aus dem Gedächtnis geflossen". *Op. cit.*, p. 71.

Cl: καὶ ἀναστήσεις τὴν σάρκα μου ταύτην τὴν ἀναντλήσασαν ταῦτα πάντα

LXX (B): ἀναστήσαι τὸ δέσμα μου τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα

In the LXX, A differs from B and $\aleph^*$ in having ἀναστήσει δέ μου τὸ σῶμα (thus also $\aleph^{c.a.}$). $\aleph^*$ differs from B only in having ἀντλοῦν for ἀναντλοῦν.¹ Thus it can be seen that Clement's variants are unique, finding no parallel in the LXX MSS (nor in the Hebrew, which differs considerably from the LXX) and yet preserving a basic identity with the LXX.²

Psalms

(6) Cl. 14.5 (Ps. 36.35-37)

This quotation agrees closely with the LXX, except for the following difference: Clement reads ἐξεζήτησα τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐχ εἶδρον for the LXX's ἐζήτησα αὐτὸν καὶ οὐχ εἰρέθη ὁ τόπος αὐτοῦ (A, B and $\aleph$).³ In one instance Clement agrees with B and $\aleph$ against A, which has the definite article before ἀσεβῆ.⁴

(7) Cl. 52.2 (Ps. 68.31-33)

Apart from some changes at the beginning of this quotation, the agreement with the LXX (B and $\aleph$; A, deficient) is close. At the beginning, Clement reads ἐξομολογήσομαι τῷ κυρίῳ for the LXX's μεγαλυνῶ αὐτὸν ἐν αἰνέσει. Since Clement specifies the indirect object τῷ κυρίῳ, the following pronoun is simply αὐτῷ, where the LXX has τῷ θεῷ.⁵ Clement's ἐκφέροντα agrees with the LXX according to B, but differs from $\aleph$, where the word is omitted.⁶

(8) Cl. 15.2 (Is. 29.13)

The opening words of this quotation differ from the LXX. Clement's words are οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσίν με τιμᾷ, while the LXX

¹ Clement as found in C reads ἀντλήσασαν, and to that extent is more similar to $\aleph^*$.

² Knopf regards the freedom of Clement's text as due to quotation from memory, and associates this with the brevity of the quotation. *Op. cit.*, p. 91.

³ Both Greek MSS of Clement agree in this reading. But the reading as found in Clement of Alexandria has been harmonized to agree with the LXX (*Stromata* IV, 32, 2). Latin, Syriac and Coptic MSS agree with the LXX.

⁴ C, however, has the article, perhaps by harmonization with LXX A. Cf. Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

⁵ In Clement of Alexandria the quotation is given in the same form as in the Roman Clement (*Stromata* IV, 113, 2). Clement's words are common in the Psalms (e.g. 7.18; 117.19 [quoted by Clement in 48.2]). Cf. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

⁶ Clement C omits the last part of the quotation, thus providing no evidence at this point. Clement of Alexandria, however, reads φέροντα κέρατα for κέρατα ἐκφέροντα (*Stromata* IV, 113, 2).

(A and κ) has ἐγγίξει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσιν (κ^* τιμοῦσιν) με (B inserts another phrase, ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν).¹ In the second part of the quotation Clement has ἄπεστιν for the LXX's ἀπέχει.² Clement's quotation, however, is paralleled quite closely in the Synoptics (Mk. 7.6; Mt. 15.8), and it may well be that he has been influenced by them in the present quotation.³

(9) Cl. 8.2 (Ezk. 33.11)

Clement agrees exactly with the LXX except for the following variants (against B and A; κ , deficient): the addition of γάρ at the beginning of the quotation;⁴ and the final τὴν μετάνοιαν, for which the LXX reads ἀποστρέφαι τὸν ἀσεβῆ ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ (A differs from B in having τὸ ἀποστρέφαι, and adding τῆς πονηρᾶς to the last words). In one further instance, Clement agrees with A in reading τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ for τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς. Clement appears to have purposefully substituted τὴν μετάνοιαν for the words of the LXX since that word not only sums up the meaning of the latter, but is very important in the sentences which precede the quotation (cf. 7.6,7; 8.1; and the introductory formula περὶ μετανόιας ἐλάλησεν μετὰ ὄρκου). It is conceivable, however, that this quotation is to be related to the quotation which immediately follows in Clement, and which may well be from a non-canonical source.⁵

In the great majority of quotations which have been discussed in this section one cannot but be impressed with the nearly word for word accuracy with which Clement quotes the LXX. The clear impression given is that Clement has in many, if not most, instances copied the quotations directly out of his LXX. It is not improbable, however, that in some instances Clement quotes from memory, thus accounting for certain variant readings. Elsewhere, but only occasionally, Clement

¹ Clement's text according to C, however, reads ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τῷ στόματι.

² C apparently corrects to ἀπέχει.

³ See below, p. 172 where the texts are juxtaposed. The quotation is also found in Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 32, 4) where it is probably dependent upon the Roman Clement, and in 2 Cl. 3.5 where it is also probably dependent on Clement (cf. ἄπεστιν for ἀπέχει). Hatch regards the shorter form of the quotation (i.e. found in Mark, Clement, Justin, etc.) as the result of frequent quotation of the words in a time of religious revival, and then handed down in a certain recension of the LXX. *Op. cit.*, p. 177f. The influence of the NT upon later quotations and MSS of the LXX is, however, not to be minimized.

⁴ C omits the γάρ, thereby agreeing with the LXX MSS.

⁵ See below, pp. 69ff; 90f.

appears to have deliberately departed from the LXX text in order to adapt the quotation to his own purposes.

B. COMPOSITE QUOTATIONS

In this section, we examine a number of quotations in Clement's epistle consisting of different OT passages which have been fused together and presented as a single entity. These quotations by nature tend to be variant rather than exact. Indeed, in some cases it is questionable whether in fact the quotation consists of a fusion of canonical passages, or whether it may not be a unity, derived instead from some non-canonical source.

We are not here concerned with series of individual quotations, the components of which are clearly marked by separate introductory formulae.¹ The existence of these series and their possible indications concerning an anthology as the source of some of Clement's quotations are discussed in the following chapter.² Nor do we here discuss quotations which follow immediately upon a preceding one without indication, although they quite conceivably could be included under the the present heading. For the most part, when the individual identity of such a quotation is apparent it has been included in the preceding section;³ when it merges with its antecedent and is thus relatively indistinguishable, it is included in the present section.

For convenience, we may divide the quotations discussed here into two categories : those compounded from the same book ; and those compounded from different books.

1. *From the Same Book*

(1) Cl. 32.2 (Gn. 15.5 and 22.17 or 26.4)

This is a brief quotation which resembles several passages in Genesis. Clement's words are : ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. In Gn. 15.5, after a reference to the stars, the words οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου are found (A and D; B and $\aleph$, deficient)—this passage having already been quoted by Clement in 10.6 (see above, p. 43). The second part of Clement's quotation, however, is similar

¹ Hatch includes these series in his chapter "On Composite Quotations from the Septuagint". *Op. cit.*, pp. 203-214. Cf. also Swete, *An Introduction to the OT in Greek*, p. 408.

² See pp. 93-103.

³ Thus, Cl. 22 (Ps. 33.12-18 and Ps. 31.10); Cl. 52 (Ps. 49.14f. and Ps. 50.19); and Cl. 56 (Ps. 117.18 and Pr. 3.12) discussed above.

to words found both in Gn. 22.17 and 26.4 : *πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς τοὺς ἀστέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* (A and D). Here it seems very probable that Clement is quoting from memory, being content to allude to the promise of God to Abraham.

(2) Cl. 17.5 (Ex. 3.11 and 4.10)

The quotation in Clement reads : *τίς εἰμι ἐγώ, ὅτι με πέμπεις ; ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι ἰσχνόφωνος καὶ βραδύγλωσσος*. The equivalent of the interrogatory clause is found in Ex. 3.11 : *τίς εἰμι ἐγώ, ὅτι πορεύσομαι πρὸς Φαραώ* (B; A omits *ἐγώ*; **κ**, deficient). The second clause is derived from Ex. 4.10 : *ἰσχνόφωνος καὶ βραδύγλωσσος ἐγὼ εἰμι* (A and B). It appears that Clement is here quoting from memory with no particular concern to give an accurate rendering of the LXX text.¹

(3) Cl. 12.4-6 (Jos. 2.3-5, 9-14, 18f.)

These words, which report the story of Rahab and the spies, are not quotations in the strict sense of the word and could be classified under OT allusions in Clement's epistle. The four introductory formulae which occur are to be regarded as belonging to the narrative rather than being technical formulae calling attention to proper quotations. However, despite the fact that Clement gives the narrative largely in his own words, there are some striking verbal agreements with the LXX. Thus in Cl. 12.4 the following similarities can be seen with Jos. 2.3-5 : *ἐξάγαγε* (= LXX B; but A, *εἰσάγαγε*); *οἱ κατάσκοποι τῆς γῆς* (LXX B, *κατασκοπεῦσαι γὰρ τὴν γῆν*); *εἰσῆλθον μὲν οἱ ἄνδρες ... πρὸς με* (LXX, *εἰσεληλύθασιν πρὸς με οἱ ἄνδρες*); and *ἀπηλθον* (LXX, *ἐξῆλθον*).² In Cl. 12.5, the sense of Jos. 2.9-13 is given, but in different words.³ The following contacts may be indicated : *ὁ γὰρ φόβος καὶ ὁ τρόμος ὑμῶν ἐπέπεσεν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν* (LXX, *ἐπιπέπτωκεν γὰρ ὁ φόβος ὑμῶν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς*) and *διασώσατέ με καὶ τὸν*

¹ Clement of Alexandria, in dependence upon our passage, reproduces the quotation verbatim (*Stromata* IV, 106, 4).

² Clement's text according to C agrees with the LXX in having *ἐξῆλθον*.

³ Clement's *γινώσκουσα γινώσκω* reflects the Hebrew "infinitive absolute", an idiom which is frequently taken up into the LXX. It does not, however, occur in the present passage, either in the LXX or MT. See Thackeray, *op. cit.*, p. 47ff. Grant regards Clement as here "providing local color". *AF* II, 34. For a discussion of this and other Semitisms in Clement's epistle, see especially E. Nestle "War der Verfasser des ersten Clemens-Briefes semitischen Abstammung?" *ZNTW* 1 (1900), 178-180; and more recently E. Werner, "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis", pp. 793-818, who argues that in the present passages Clement is dependent upon "an old, certainly pre-Christian stratum of Midrashic tradition" (p. 807).

οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου (LXX, ζωγήσατε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου). In Cl. 12.6, Jos. 2.14, 19f. is alluded to and although the language differs considerably, the word *συνάξεις* is also found in the LXX (2.18). It seems difficult to allow that Clement in these sentences accurately witnesses to a LXX text divergent from ours.¹ Instead, it is quite probable that Clement is giving the account in his own words, and because of his familiarity with the LXX to some extent inevitably reflects its language.²

(4) Cl. 39.3-9 (Job 4.16-5.5 and 15.15)

This is a very long quotation which is in almost exact agreement with the LXX of Job 4.16-5.5. The main departure from the latter is found in the insertion of a clause from Job 15.15, *οὐρανὸς δὲ οὐ καθαρὸς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*, towards the beginning of the quotation, an insertion which agrees verbatim with the LXX of Job 15.15 (A, B and $\aleph$). While there are a number of variants in the larger quotation, only six of these are not paralleled in the main LXX MSS : οἱ κατοικοῦντες for τοὺς κατοικοῦντας in 4.19; the omission of γάρ in 4.21; the omission of ἀπώλοντο in 4.21 (in LXX A it is displaced and an extra καί added); ρίζας for ρίζαν in 5.3; the omission of δέ in 5.4; and ἡτοίμασται for συγγήγαγον (B and $\aleph$; ἐθέρισαν, A). The remaining variants may be listed as follows. Agreements of Clement with B and $\aleph$, against A : ἐξ ὧν for ἐξ οὗ (4.19); the position of ἐσμέν after πηλοῦ (4.19); position of καί before ἀπὸ πρωΐθεν (4.20); omission of καί before παρὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι (4.20); σοι ὑπακούσεται for σου εἰσακούσετε (5.1); εὐθέως for εὐθύς (5.3); ἐβρώθη αὐτῶν ἡ δίαίτα for ἡ δίαίτα αὐτῶν ἐβρώθη (5.3); γένοιτο for ἐγένοντο (5.4); κολαβρισθείησαν for σκολαβρισθίησαν (5.4); ἐξαίρετοι ἔσσονται for ἐξερεθίσονται (5.5).³ On the other hand, with A, against B and $\aleph$, are the following variants in Clement : the presence of ἕα (4.19); and ἐτελεύτησαν for ἐξηράνθησαν (4.21). In only four places does A agree with $\aleph$ against B,

¹ Lightfoot mentions Cotelier's conjecture that Clement's LXX must have read καὶ κατέπτισον πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν ἀφ' ὑμῶν (Jos. 2.9) as found in the Complutensian edition, agreeing with the Hebrew. I, 2, 49. However, in light of the great number of other departures from the LXX and MT it is difficult to give credence to this viewpoint.

² Cf. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 61. Grant writes "Clement departs from the text in a manner reminiscent of Josephus (*Ant.* 5, 1-15.26)" wherein "direct quotations become indirect, and vice-versa, and the story becomes much clearer for a Greek reader". *AF* II, 34.

³ In two of these variants Clement according to C sides with LXX (A) : σου for σοι (5.1), εὐθύς (5.3).

and in the first three of these Clement also goes against B: *ἐναντι κυρίου* for *ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου* (4.17); *ἕως* for *μέχρι* (4.20); *ἀγίων ἀγγέλων* for *ἀγγέλων ἀγίων* (5.1); *έώρακα* for *έώρακα* (5.3).¹ *κ** stands against both A and B in only one place, *αὐτούς* for *αὐτοῖς* (4.21), and is not followed by Clement. It can again be seen that Clement's text does not follow any of our LXX MSS consistently, although perhaps in the present instance the agreement with *κ* is notable. The inserted clause is probably to be explained as Clement's own insertion, owing to the similarity of the passages and Clement's thorough knowledge of Job.² At the same time, in the light of the exactness with which Clement otherwise gives the quotation, it is not impossible that the words were in Clement's LXX, perhaps as a kind of scribal gloss.³

(5) Cl. 26.2 (Ps. 27.7; 3.6 and 22.4; cf. Ps. 87.11).

This brief quotation consists of phraseology drawn from at least two, and possibly three or four passages in the Psalms. The first part of the quotation reads *καὶ ἐξαναστήσεις με καὶ ἐξομολογήσομαι σοι*, to which the closest parallel is found in Ps. 27.7 *καὶ ἀνέθαλεν ἡ σὰρξ μου καὶ ἐκ θελήματός μου ἐξομολογήσομαι αὐτῷ* (thus B and *κ*; A having *ἀνέθαλλεν*). We may compare, however, similar words in Ps. 87.11: *ἡ ἰατροὶ ἀναστήσουσιν καὶ ἐξομολογήσονται σοι* (A, B and *κ*). The words which follow in Clement are *καὶ ἐκοιμήθην καὶ ὑπνώσα ἐξηγέρθην, ὅτι σὺ μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶ*.⁴ These are quite clearly derived from Ps. 3.6, which agrees verbatim except for the presence of *ἐγώ* (A adds further, *δέ*) before *ἐκοιμήθην*, and the last clause which reads *ὅτι κύριος ἀντιλήμψεται μου* (A and B; *κ*, *ἀντελάβετο*). Clement's words *ὅτι σὺ μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶ* are found in Ps. 22.4. It seems probable that Clement is quoting from memory and thus conflates similar language from different passages into one quotation.⁵ That this is the

¹ C follows A and *κ* only in the first of these four variants.

² Lightfoot writes "The fact that nearly the same words occur as the first clause of xv. 15, which are found likewise in iv. 18, has led Clement to insert the second clause also of this same verse in the other passage to which it does not belong". I, 2, 119. Knopf similarly notes "Die gleiche Umgebung hier und dort hat die Uebernahme erleichtert, Job 15.14-16 wiederholt Job 4.17-19 sehr stark". *Op. cit.*, p. 111.

³ Grant is of the opinion that Clement's LXX contained the variant *ἡτοίμασται* for *συνήγαγον* (or *ἐθέμισαν*, A) and that this points to a LXX text that has been "apparently Christianized". *AF* II, 67.

⁴ The Latin translator of Clement's epistle, aware that the words are not found in the same passage, inserts *et iterum scriptum est*.

⁵ While there can be no certainty (cf. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 91), it seems hasty to conclude with Gebhardt and Harnack that "e libro apocrypho verba desumpta sunt". *Patres*

case, appears also from the introductory formula λέγει γάρ που, suggesting that Clement did not bother to verify the exact wording of the passage(s).

2. From Different Books

(6) Cl. 13.1 (Je. 9.22f. and 1 Regn. 2.10)

Clement's quotation is paralleled in two OT passages, and the form of the quotation seems to have been influenced by both of these passages. We here juxtapose the quotation and its parallels.

<i>Clement 13.1</i> (Text of A) ¹	<i>Jeremiah 9.22f.</i> (A, B and N) ²	<i>1 Regn. 2.10</i> (A and B; N, deficient)
μη καυχάσθω ὁ σοφός ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ	μη καυχάσθω ὁ σοφός ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ μη καυχάσθω ὁ ἰσχυρός ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτοῦ καὶ μη καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' ἡ ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω τοῦ ἐκζητεῖν αὐτὸν	μη καυχάσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ καὶ μη καυχάσθω ὁ δυνατός ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ καὶ μη καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' ἡ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς.
καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην.	καὶ ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς .	

In the first half of the quotation, Clement agrees with the Jeremiah passage against that of 1 Reigns. Clement, however, avoids the repetition of the verb *μη καυχάσθω*, employing *μηδέ* with each member instead. In the middle of the quotation Clement's *ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν*

Apostolici. Clementis Romani ad Corinthios Quae Dicuntur Epistulae (Lipsiae, 1876), p. 45. O. Knoch also writes that Clement very probably derived the quotation from a non-canonical source, and suggests as that source "einer Art christl. Testimonienbuch über die leibl. Auferstehung, gruppiert um das Verb *ἀνίστημι*". *Eigenart und Bedeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufriss des ersten Clemensbriefes* (Bonn, 1964), p. 154. Cf. Daniélou, *op. cit.*, p. 109. Grant refers the variants either to memory or the use of an anthology. *AF* II, 52.

¹ C varies only in the omission of *ἡ* before *ὁ καυχώμενος*.

² The LXX witnesses are unanimous concerning the text, with the one slight omission of the definite article before *ποιῶν* in N.

κυρίῳ καυχάσθω is found in neither of the parallel passages. These words are, however, found verbatim in 1 Cor. 1.31. It is possible that both Paul and Clement derived the words from a different version of Jeremiah (or 1 Reigns), but more probably Clement has derived the words from 1 Corinthians, an epistle with which he was certainly acquainted.¹ The final part of the quotation agrees more closely with 1 Reigns than with Jeremiah. Clement's *ἐκζητεῖν αὐτόν* is the equivalent of *συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον*. Since Clement has just mentioned *κύριος*, the pronoun *αὐτόν* is sufficient. In Clement, as in 1 Reigns, it is man who is to execute judgement and righteousness, rather than *κύριος* as in Jeremiah. The peculiarities of Clement's quotation cannot be accounted for on the basis of the Hebrew of Je. 9.23f. (which is close to the LXX) or of 1 Sa. 2.10 (which lacks the quotation). Indeed the similarities between Clement and the parallels, and the confusion of both of these together with the clause from 1 Corinthians, are explainable most easily by means of quotation from memory. The supposition of an unknown source and direct literary dependence upon that source, although possible, is both difficult and unnecessary.

(7) Cl. 14.4 (Pr. 2.21 and Ps. 36.38)

There is considerable uncertainty as to the text of the LXX for Pr. 2.21. The first part of Clement's brief quotation agrees verbatim with the LXX as found in A except for Clement's *ἐπ' αὐτῆς* for *ἐν αὐτῇ*. *κ** differs further only in substituting *καὶ ὅσοι* for *ἄκακοι* *δέ*. However, the words are lacking in the LXX according to B, except for *καὶ ὅσοι ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ* which according to A is the second occurrence of these words in the verse (only the first having *ἄκακοι* instead of *ὅσοι*). Omitting two stichoi found in the Proverbs passage, Clement continues with the words *οἱ δὲ παρανομούντες ἐξολεθρευθήσονται ἀπ' αὐτῆς* which agrees with the LXX (Pr. 2.22) except for the latter's *παράνομοι* and the verb *ἐξωσθήσονται* (A, B and *κ*). Clement's verb, however, is found in Ps. 36.38 (the preceding verses of this Psalm are quoted by Clement immediately following) which reads *οἱ δὲ παράνομοι ἐξολεθρευθήσονται ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*.²

¹ Harnack writes "Die Abweichungen vom A.T. zeigen, dass 1. Kor. 1, 31 benutzt ist". *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 109. See below for a fuller discussion, p. 203f.

² The same verb occurs in two other places in the same Psalm, one of these being the present verse (Ps. 36.38; cf. 36.9).

(8) Cl. 18.1 (Ps. 88.21 and 1 Regn. 13.14)

The differences between Clement's combination and the LXX passages are considerable. The Psalm passage is the basic component of the quotation, into which has been inserted the words *ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου* from 1 Regn. 13.14. Further differences are to be seen in Clement's *Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί*, lacking in the LXX passages, and the substitution of *αἰωνίῳ* for *ἀγίῳ* (cf. Is. 54.8). However, almost the identical quotation is found in Acts 13.22, thus showing that the passages had already been combined in this way before Clement wrote his epistle. Clement, it would appear, either took the quotation from the same source as the writer of Acts, or is dependent upon Acts itself.¹

(9) Cl. 23.5 (Is. 13.22 and Mal. 3.1)

A brief quotation, the first part of which agrees with the LXX (Is. 13.22) except for Clement's verb *ῥῆξει* for *ἔρχεται* (cf. Hab. 2.3 and Heb. 10.37, and the following words in Clement for *ῥῆξει*). The second part of the quotation in Clement is very nearly in exact agreement with Mal. 3.1. The variants from the LXX text (A, B and $\aleph$) are: the position of *κύριος* and the addition of the article *ὁ*; the insertion of *ὁ ἅγιος* before *ὄν*; and *προσδοκᾶτε* for *ζητεῖτε*. In one variant, *αὐτοῦ*, Clement agrees with LXX A and C, against B and $\aleph$, which have *ἐαυτοῦ*. This combination of passages is quite possibly the result of quotation from memory, which would also account for the variants in Clement's text.²

(10) Cl. 34.3 (Is. 40.10 and Pr. 24.12)

The first part of this brief composite quotation in Clement may be juxtaposed with the LXX, with certain omissions, as follows:

Cl: *ἰδοὺ ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ*³

LXX: *ἰδοὺ κύριος ... καὶ ... ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ* (A and B;
 $\aleph$ omits *ἰδοὺ*)

¹ See the discussion below, p. 259, where the texts are juxtaposed. The quotation is also found in Clement of Alexandria, where, however, *ἀγίῳ* replaces *αἰωνίῳ* (*Stromata* IV, 107,1).

² Thus Lightfoot, who accounts for Clement's *ἅγιος* as an inadvertent substitution for *ἄγγελος* (in Mal. 3.1). Clement according to Lightfoot "quotes from memory largely but loosely and is influenced by the interpretation which he has in view". I, 2, 82. Cf. Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 86f. Grant, however, wonders whether the *καὶ* of the introductory formula could possibly point back to the apocryphal writing just previously quoted by Clement. *AF* II, 49. Knoch, on the other hand, says of the composite quotation that it may have been derived from "einer vermutlich bereits schriftlich fixierten christlichen Testimoniensammlung". *Op. cit.*, p. 134.

³ C omits the article before *κύριος*.

Clement may thus be abridging the Isaiah passage, or simply rendering it freely from memory. For the words *πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ*, the final words of Is. 40.10 may be compared, *ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ*. The exact words, however, occur in a similar context in Is. 62.11. The second part of the quotation has its parallel in Pr. 24.12:

Cl: ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστω κατὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ

LXX: ὁς ἀποδίδωσιν ἐκάστω κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ (A, B and $\aleph$)

The combination of these texts was probably suggested by the final words of Is. 40.10, *καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ*. A similar quotation is found in Rev. 22.12, but despite some striking agreement (i.e. in *ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστω*) the text varies from that of Clement, and no direct connection is probable.¹ Possibly Clement combined these passages himself, but the presence of the same combination in Revelation may well indicate that they were already combined in traditional sources, and thus the combination may derive from an apocryphal writing.²

(11) Cl. 34.6 (Dn. 7.10; Is. 6.3)

The first part of this quotation agrees exactly with Dn. 7.10, according to Theodotion,³ except for the transposition of clauses, Clement beginning with *μύριαι* rather than *χίλιαι*. Clement has *ἐλειτούργουν* in the *χίλιαι* clause with Theodotion against the "Old Greek" or "LXX".⁴ The words *μυριάδες μυριάδων καὶ χιλιάδες χιλιάδων*

¹ See below, p. 270. Clement of Alexandria has the same quotation, but reads *ἀπὸ* before *προσώπου αὐτοῦ* and the plural *τὰ ἔργα*, corrected to agree with the LXX (*Stromata* IV, 135, 3).

² Grant discusses the passage and concludes that Clement was quoting from memory rather than from a non-canonical source. *AF* II, 61. But he also suggests that the quotation may have been drawn from an anthology source. *Ibid.*, p. 12. See below, p. 99ff.

³ Almost all of the Greek MSS of the OT contain the text of Daniel not as it was originally, but in the revised translation of Theodotion (thus A and B; $\aleph$ is lacking for Daniel). The earlier translation departed considerably from the Hebrew text, and survives only in a few MSS (usually designated collectively as *o*). See J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1927), pp. 24-29; 35-43. J. Ziegler, *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*, Septuaginta ... Soc. Litt. Göttingensis (Göttingen, 1954), pp. 7-68.

⁴ Ziegler, however, lists Clement together with Barnabas and Hermas as providing quotations "die allerdings nicht wörtlich sind, aber deutlich den *o*-Text voraussetzen". *Op. cit.*, p. 22. Since both Greek traditions agree in the transposition of clauses (against Clement), the reading which is closest to Clement is the Theodotionic. In the allusions to Daniel (6.16; 3.19ff.) in Cl. 45.6f., Clement's use of the Hebrew names *Ανανίας*, *᾿Αζαρίας* and *Μισαήλ*, may favour the view that Clement used the older Greek version (although the Hebrew names occur there also; cf. 1.11; 3.25). Grant takes this point up,

found in Rev. 5.11 (alluding to Dn. 7.10) reveal the sequence *μύριαι-χίλιαι* found in Clement. This indicates no direct connection, but suggests either that this order was also in current use, or that the order could be altered freely.¹ The second half of Clement's quotation agrees exactly with Is. 6.3 as found in the LXX except for the substitution of *ἡ κτίσις* for *ἡ γῆ* (A, B and $\aleph$).² B differs from A and $\aleph$ in the further slight variant *ἐκέκραγεν* for *ἐκέκραγον*. Clement has either combined the texts himself, or borrowed the combination from some other source.³

(12) Cl. 50.4 (Is. 26.20 and Ezk. 37.12)

In the first half of this quotation, the agreement with the LXX (A, B and $\aleph$), allowing for a slight ellipsis, is quite marked. Clement omits, after *τὰ ταμεῖα*, the word *σοῦ* as well as the following *ἀποκλείσων τὴν θύραν σου, ἀποκρύβηθι*. Beyond this and Clement's *ἕως οὗ* for the LXX's *ἕως ἄν* the agreement is exact. Only at the very end does Clement further depart from the LXX in the words *ἡ ὀργὴ καὶ θυμὸς μου* for the LXX's *ἡ ὀργὴ κυρίου*. The words with which Clement's quotation continues are : *καὶ μνησθήσομαι ἡμέρας ἀγαθῆς, καὶ ἀναστήσω ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν θηκῶν ὑμῶν*. The first clause is without parallel in the OT or Apocrypha, but the second is probably derived from Ezk. 37.12 where it is found exactly (A and B; $\aleph$, deficient) except for the substitutions *ἀνάξω* and *μνημάτων*.⁴ The combination of this Ezekiel passage with the Isaiah passage may well have been suggested by the preceding words in the Isaiah passage (Is. 26.19). Clement may be freely quoting from memory and confusing the pas-

contending that since Clement is dependent upon the older version, which does not contain *ἐλειτούργουν*, the present quotation may be derived from an anthology. *AF* II, 61.

¹ Lightfoot lists other places where the order of the clauses varies, sometimes within the same writing, and concludes that "no stress can be laid on this coincidence which seems to be purely accidental". I, 2, 105.

² C, however, reads *ἡ γῆ* perhaps by harmonization with the LXX.

³ Much has been made of the possible liturgical significance of the material in Cl. 34. Cf. the excursus in Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 102f. This raises the possibility of a liturgical source for the two composite quotations and one possibly apocryphal quotation in the chapter. W. C. van Unnik has argued strongly, however, that the setting of the quotation in 34.6 is not liturgical but eschatological. "I Clement 34 and the 'Sanctus'", *VC* 5 (1951), 204-248. Van Unnik emphasizes Clement's use of *ἡ γραφή* in the introductory formula of the present quotation as pointing to a written source, and therefore not liturgy, p. 225. Cf. Grant, who cites van Unnik approvingly. *AF* II, 62.

⁴ Lightfoot explains the words of the first clause as possibly "intended to give the general purport of the promise which they introduce". I, 2, 151.

sages, or he may be dependent upon some writing no longer known to us.¹

The above discussion reveals the difficulty of accounting for the composite quotations in Clement's epistle. That an actual combination of the pertinent OT texts has taken place seems probable for most of these quotations. But in many of the instances, it remains questionable whether Clement has combined the passages (deliberately or from memory?), or whether he has taken over a combination from traditional sources or apocryphal writings. The question of alternative sources is also relevant for the more variant quotations in Clement's epistle, to which we now turn.

C. NON-SEPTUAGINTAL QUOTATIONS

In speaking of these particular quotations as "non-septuagintal", we do not refer to their origin but to their text-form. That is, it is quite conceivable that a quotation is from the LXX but is rendered freely, perhaps from memory, and thus varies considerably from the text of the LXX. On the other hand, a variant quotation may possibly suggest non-septuagintal derivations. The quotations considered here are mainly those which seem probably to derive from the LXX, although certain other quotations whose derivation remains to some extent undecided are also included. A number of variant quotations have already been discussed above, under the heading of composite quotations.

(1) Cl. 3.1 (Dt. 32.15)

*Clement*²

ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔπιεν,
καὶ ἐπλατύνθη καὶ ἐπαχύνθη,
καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἡγαπημένος.

LXX (A and B; **Σ** lacking)

καὶ ἔφαγεν Ἰακώβ,
καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη,
καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἡγαπημένος,
ἐλιπάνθη, ἐπαχύνθη, ἐπλατύνθη.

Clement appears either to have consciously reshaped the passage in accordance with his own purposes, or to be quoting from memory, and

¹ Grant suggests the possibility of an apocryphal Ezekiel. *AF* II, 82. Knopf mentions V Ezra [=2 Esdras] 2.16, but notes that it is to be dated later than Clement's epistle. *Op. cit.*, p. 127. Daniélou suggests that the quotation may be drawn from an early Jewish Christian *targum* (Greek). *Op. cit.*, p. 95; 120f.

² The text of A, except for ἀπεγαλάκτισεν for which (with Lightfoot) we accept the reading of C (ἀπελάκτισεν) and the versions as the correct one.

merely giving the gist of the passage.¹ Not only is the order of the clauses quite different from the LXX (and also from the Hebrew),² but the words *ἐφαγεν καὶ ἔπιεν* are possibly an allusion to 1 Cor. 10.7 (cf. 15.32).³

(2) Cl. 20.7 (Job 38.11)

Clement ⁴

ἕως ὧδε ἦξεις
καὶ τὰ κύματά σου
ἐν σοὶ συντριβήσεται.

LXX (A, B and $\aleph$)

μέχρι τούτου ἐλεύσῃ
καὶ οὐχ ὑπερβήσῃ, ἀλλ' ἐν σεαυτῇ
συντριβήσεται σου τὰ κύματα.

Apart from the omitted words, and the different wording, especially of the first clause, the substance of the quotation is essentially in agreement with the LXX text. It is also clear that the Job passage is in Clement's mind from the allusory words preceding the citation οὐ παρεκβαίνει τὰ περιτεθειμένα αὐτῇ κλεῖθρα, ἀλλὰ καθὼς διέταξεν αὐτῇ, with which the words of Job 38.10 may be compared, ἐθέμην δὲ αὐτῇ ὅρια, περιθεῖς κλεῖθρα καὶ πύλας (A, B and $\aleph$). It seems probable that the form of the quotation is to be explained on the basis of memory ⁵ rather than a variant text or an alternative source.

(3) Cl. 21.2 (Pr. 20.27)

Clement ⁶

πνεῦμα κυρίου
λύχνον ἔρευνῶν
τὰ ταμεία τῆς γαστροῦς.

LXX (A)

φῶς κυρίου πνοὴ ἀνθρώπων
ἡ λύχνος ὃς ἐρευνᾷ
ταμεία κοιλίας.

In the LXX, B and $\aleph$ differ further in omitting ἡ λύχνος.⁷ Again, the

¹ K. Beyschlag, who finds the early chapters of Clement's epistle heavily laden with traditional materials, regards the present quotation as having been derived from the LXX and added by Clement to the tradition which he uses. *Clemens Romanus und der Frühkatholizismus* p. 137.

² The change in the order of clauses is quite probably Clement's own doing. Since immediately prior to the quotation Clement uses the word *πλατυσμός* in a good sense (cf. Ps. 118.45; 17.20; etc.) he understands the verb *ἐπλατύνθη* as referring to the blessing of God rather than to the evil heart of the people, and consequently transfers the verb from after to before *ἀπελάττισεν*. Cf. Beyschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 137f. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

³ Thus Grant, *AF* II, 21. It is not impossible, however, that Clement has in mind the passage in Ex. 32.6. See below, p. 208.

⁴ Text of A, except for the spelling variant *κρύματα* for *κύματα*.

⁵ Thus Gebhardt and Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁶ C differs in reading *λύχνος*, which agrees with the LXX (A).

⁷ Lightfoot suggests that ἡ λύχνος of A is a gloss providing an alternative reading for φῶς (cf. Pr. 6.23) I, 2, 76.

substance of the quotation, despite the variants, is clearly septuagintal.¹ Clement quotes loosely, quite probably from memory.² This conclusion is suggested not only by the form of Clement's quotation but also by the indefinite formula, *λέγει γάρ σου*.

(4) Cl. 28.3 (Ps. 138.7-10)

<i>Clement</i> ³	<i>LXX</i> (A and B)
ποῦ ἀφήξω καὶ ποῦ κρυβήσομαι	ποῦ πορευθῶ
ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου ;	ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός σου
	καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου
	ποῦ φύγω ;
ἐὰν ἀναβῶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν,	ἐὰν ἀναβῶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν,
σὺ εἶ ἐκεῖ.	σὺ εἶ ἐκεῖ.
ἐὰν ἀπέλθω εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς γῆς	ἐὰν καταβῶ εἰς τὸν ἄδην,
ἐκεῖ ἡ δεξιὰ σου.	πάρει.
ἐὰν καταστρώσω εἰς τὰς ἀβύσσους,	ἐὰν ἀναλαβῶ τὰς πτέρυγάς μου κατ' ὄρθον
	καὶ κατασκηνώσω εἰς τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς θαλάσσης,
ἐκεῖ τὸ πνεῦμά σου.	καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖ ἡ χεὶρ σου ὁδηγήσει με,
	καὶ καθέξει με ἡ δεξιὰ σου.

κ* diverges from A and B in having *ποῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου φύγω* (= MT) and *λάβοιμι* for *ἀναλαβῶ*. The similarities between Clement's quotation and the text of the LXX are unmistakable. At the same time, Clement diverges considerably from the LXX, particularly towards the end of the quotation. The parallel passage in Am. 9.2f. presents some similarities with Clement's quotation, but none which is not already found in Ps. 138. Lightfoot has called attention to Clement's *καταστρώσω* which agrees with the Hebrew *נִסְכַּח* against the LXX's *καταβῶ*. However, since Clement nowhere else betrays a personal knowledge of Hebrew, it is probable that he took the word from another source, possibly an alternate Greek translation, or from Jewish tradition.⁴ It seems to be equally possible that Clement is quoting Ps. 138.7ff. from memory or that he has derived the quotation

¹ Lightfoot correctly rejects Hilgenfeld's conjecture that Clement's words *πνεῦμα κυρίου* are to be regarded as a part of the introductory formula rather than part of the text. I, 2, 76.

² Thus Gebhardt and Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 39. Daniélou, however, prefers the use of a Jewish Christian *targum* (Greek). *Op. cit.*, p. 108f.

³ C differs in having *ἐκεῖ εἶ* for *εἶ ἐκεῖ*, and *σὺ ἐκεῖ εἶ* for *ἐκεῖ ἡ δεξιὰ σου*.

⁴ Thus Lightfoot I, 2, 92f. Lightfoot points to the presence of a similar Greek rendering (*ἐὰν στρώσω*) in Origen's Hexapla (cf. Field's *Origenis Hexaplorum* II, 292), and conjectures that Clement derived the variant from one of the versions known to Origen.

from a non-canonical source.¹ The introductory formula λέγει γάρ που τὸ γραφεῖον may support the conclusion that it is a memory quotation derived from the "writing" or third part of the Hebrew canon, and hence our Psalm passage.²

(5) Cl. 42.5 (Is. 60.17)

<i>Clement</i>	<i>LXX (A, B and X)</i>
καταστήσω	δώσω
τοὺς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν	τοὺς ἄρχοντας σου
ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ	ἐν εἰρήνῃ
καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν	καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου
ἐν πίστει.	ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.

The form of the quotation remains septuagintal although a number of words have been altered and the lines transposed. Since the one variant (διακόνους) is important for Clement's argument, the text may well have been deliberately altered to its present reading.³ Clement, however, may simply be quoting from memory, and mistakenly remembering διακόνους for ἄρχοντας, as perhaps the other variants, which are insignificant for Clement's argument, suggest.⁴ Also to be noted is the explicitly indefinite introductory formula, οὕτως γάρ που λέγει ἡ γραφή which may confirm the quotation as given from memory. On the other hand, it is not impossible that Clement has derived the saying from a different text of the LXX or from an entirely different source.⁵

¹ Cf. Knopf, "Es ist sehr schwer zu sagen, wie Clem. zu der Form gekommen ist, die er bringt". *Op. cit.*, p. 92. Grants notes that the LXX as it stands would have been a more effective buttress for Clement's argument. *AF* II, 53. The quotation with variants is also found in Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 135, 2) but is probably dependent on Clement of Rome.

² On the significance of γραφεῖον for the canon, see below, p. 116f.

³ Gebhardt and Harnack ask "de industria?" *Op. cit.*, p. 69. In his monograph, Harnack refers to the practice of deliberately correcting the LXX text to make clear a doubtful passage. *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 69, n. 1. Cf. also Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 53f. See further, below p. 123. Irenaeus employs the quotation for a similar purpose, but with the correct reading of the LXX (*Haer.* IV, 26, 5).

⁴ Lightfoot says the quotation is from Isaiah, but loosely quoted, and that διάκονοι is the result of "misquotation". I, 2, 129. It is possible, however, that the word results from the influence of Phil. 1.1. See below, p. 227f.

⁵ Grant thus asks "perhaps a collection of testimonies?" *AF* II, 72. Cf. Hatch, who speaks of a "revised text of the LXX" which Clement may have used. *Op. cit.*, p. 179. Daniélou suggests the use of a Jewish Christian *targum*. *Op. cit.*, p. 109.

The quotations which have been discussed here, as well as the variant quotations which were discussed as composite quotations, stand in contrast to the large number of exact quotations in Clement's epistle. If the standard of exactness of quotation in Clement's epistle remained constant throughout, dependence upon a non-septuagintal source for these variant quotations would be the natural conclusion. That Clement did, in fact, occasionally quote from non-canonical sources is certain, and to these quotations we now direct our attention.

D. NON-CANONICAL QUOTATIONS

We divide these quotations into two groups, those from writings known to us as Apocrypha, and those from unknown sources. In the latter group, we include three quotations which find remote parallels in the LXX, but which are so divergent from the LXX text that they are very probably derived from the same or similar apocryphal writings known to Clement.

1. *Apocrypha*

While there are a few possible allusions to the Apocrypha, these generally consist of two or three words, occurring in the great prayer of Clement, which are readily explainable by a common linguistic background and which thus remain quite unconvincing.¹ It is quite certain, however, that Clement alludes to the book of Judith, whose heroine he explicitly mentions in 55.4f. (cf. Judith 8-13). The only book in the Apocrypha from which Clement quotes is Wisdom. There are two quotations,² but in neither instance is an introductory formula employed.

(1) Cl. 3.4 (Wisd. 2.24).

This brief quotation consists of the words *θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον* which are found verbatim in Wisd. 2.24 (A, B and κ), but there it is through the envy of the devil rather than the jealousy of Cain that death comes. There is a parallel in Rom. 5.12, but the wording is different. The most natural conclusion is that Clement has

¹ E.g. compare the prayer language of Cl. 60.1 (*δίκαιος κτλ*) with Tobit 3.2; and similarly Cl. 61.2 (*βασίλεῦ τῶν αἰώνων*) with Tobit 13.7,11; Cl. 60.1 (*ἐλεῆμιν καὶ οἰκτίρμιν*) with Sir. 2.11 (*οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων*); and 59.3 with a number of Apocrypha and other writings (cf. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 139f.).

² There is also a possible allusion to Wisdom (12.10) in Cl. 7.5, but the similarity consists only in the words *μεταβολῆς τόπων*.

borrowed the words from Wisdom and has inserted them into his own context where ζῆλος is in question. On the other hand, Clement may have derived the words of Wisdom indirectly through traditional materials.¹

(2) Cl. 27.5 (Wisd. 12.12)

<i>Clement</i>	<i>LXX (A, B and X)</i>
τίς ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ ·	τίς γάρ ἐρεῖ ·
τί ἐποίησας ;	τί ἐποίησας ;
ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται	ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται
τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος.	τῷ κρίματί σου ;

Apart from the slight variants of the opening words, and the final phrase τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος, Clement's quotation agrees exactly with Wisd. 12.12. The final phrase is possibly due to the influence of Wisd. 11.21 καὶ κράτει βραχίονός σου τίς ἀντιστήσεται,² although the closer parallel τὸ κράτος τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ is found in Ephesians (1.19; 6.10), a writing with which Clement may have been familiar. It seems probable that the slightly variant form of Clement's quotation is the result of quotation from memory.

2. *Unknown Writings*

(3) Cl. 8.3

The quotation in Clement reads as follows :

μετανοήσατε, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας ὑμῶν · εἰπον τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ μου · ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν πυρρότεραι κόκκου καὶ μελανώτεραι σάκκου, καὶ ἐπιστραφήτε πρὸς με ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἰπήτε, Πάτερ ἐπακούσομαι ὑμῶν ὡς λαῶ ἀγίῳ.³

As it stands, there is no one canonical passage which parallels the whole of Clement's quotation. Thus if Clement is not dependent upon a non-canonical source, he may be conflating a number of canonical passages, consciously or unconsciously, to produce the present quotation. The most likely canonical passages which may lie behind the quotation are the following (the text given is that of Rahlfs). With

¹ For the view that Clement is here dependent upon *Gemeindetradition*, see Beyschlag, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-67.

² Thus Knopf, who writes "die Anführungen sind gedächtnismässig miteinander vermischet worden". *Op. cit.*, p. 91. Cf. Grant, *AF* II, 53.

³ The text is that of A; C differs in the following: the substitution of τοῦ λαοῦ μου for ὑμῶν after ἀνομίας; ψυχῆς for καρδίας; λαοῦ ἀγίου for λαῶ ἀγίῳ.

the first clause compare Ezk. 18.30 οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, λέγει κύριος · ἐπιστράφητε καὶ ἀποστρέψαιε ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀσεβειῶν ὑμῶν. The verses which follow are quite similar in content to the words from Ezk. 33.11 which are quoted by Clement just prior to the present quotation, thereby making the connection of the passages understandable. With the first clause beginning ἐὰν ᾧσιν, may be compared Ps. 102.10f: οὐ κατὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἐποίησεν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ κατὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν ἀνταπέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὅτι κατὰ τὸ ὕψος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐκραταίωσεν κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ τοὺς φοβουμένους αὐτόν. This does not say the same thing that Clement says, but the components of Clement's quotation are present and conceivably the confusion could have occurred by citation from memory. For the second ἐὰν ᾧσιν clause we may compare Is. 1.18 ἐὰν ᾧσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικοῦν ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ, ἐὰν δὲ ᾧσιν ὡς κόκκινον, ὡς ἔριον λευκανῶ. There is a general similarity between the passages, but the agreement is not close. Moreover, the Isaiah passage is quoted in almost exact agreement with the LXX immediately following our present passage, where it is introduced as if from another book with the formula καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει οὕτως¹. With the last part of the quotation the passage in Je. 3.19 may be compared, εἶπα Πατέρα, καλέσετέ με καὶ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οὐκ ἀποστραφήσεσθε ... ἐπιστράφητε ... καὶ ἰάσσομαι τὰ συντρίμματα ὑμῶν. Again, the similarity is only very general.

It seems very improbable that Clement is quoting from memory and confusing passages, despite the fact that this phenomenon does seem to occur elsewhere in Clement.² There are perhaps too many passages involved for this to be a probable explanation. But, more important than this, some of the words find no canonical parallels that are readily apparent, and at least one of the clauses (i.e. εἰπον τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ μου) does not fit smoothly into the flow of words, and is thus probably not the result of memory quotation (which naturally tends to avoid awkward idiom), but instead suggests the more or less accurate transmission of a specific passage.

Possible evidence for the existence of an apocryphal Ezekiel is found in two passages in Clement of Alexandria which closely parallel Clement's quotation. With the first part may be compared words from

¹ For this quotation, see above, p. 49.

² We agree with Gebhardt and Harnack who write "Sed vix probabile est, Clementem ex his versibus orationem consarcinasse". *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

Quis dives salvetur 39, 4: οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν καὶ ὧσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικοῦν ἔριον, ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ, καὶ μελάντερον τοῦ σκότους, ὡς ἔριον λευκὸν ἐκνίψας ποιήσω. The first sentence in this passage may be seen to parallel very closely the quotation (discussed above as a variant quotation of Ezk. 33.11) which immediately precedes the present one in Clement. The remainder of the passage is similar to the present quotation and yet quite different.¹ The second passage in the Alexandrian Clement is found in *Paedagogos* I, 91, 2: φησὶ γὰρ δι' Ἰεζεκιήλ· ἐὰν ἐπιστραφήτε ἐξ ὑλῆς τῆς καρδίας καὶ εἴπητε· Πάτερ, ἀκούσομαι ὑμῶν ὥσπερ λαοῦ ἁγίου. This parallels very closely the last part of our quotation. The introduction of the quotation as from Ezekiel is important and since the quotation is not found in our canonical Ezekiel, it is possible that the Alexandrian is referring to an apocryphal Ezekiel, used also by the Roman Clement. On the other hand, Clement of Alexandria, as we have seen, is often dependent upon his namesake for quotations, and it may be that he is here also dependent upon Clement² and has inferred from Clement's text that the words in question were found in Ezekiel, since they are introduced with the words *προστιθεὶς καὶ γνώμην ἀγαθὴν* following a passage quoted from Ezk. 33.11. Yet when the Alexandrian copies the Roman Clement's quotations he usually does so quite accurately whereas in the present instance there are a fair number of divergences between the two quotations.³ Although it is far from impossible, it seems unlikely that the one Clement is here dependent on the other.

Since we have evidence, not only here but elsewhere, of the existence of an apocryphal Ezekiel, which may well have utilized and transformed material from the canonical Ezekiel,⁴ an appealing explanation of the present quotation is that it was derived from this document.⁵

¹ Stählin in his apparatus indicates Ezk. 18.23 and Is. 1.18 as the source of the words in Clement of Alexandria. *Clemens Alexandrinus* III (Leipzig, 1909), p. 185.

² Stählin indicates "wohl aus Clem. Rom. I, 8, 3". *Op. cit.*, (Leipzig, 1905), p. 143.

³ Moreover, all the other borrowed quotations are without exception found in *Stromata* rather than in the present two works.

⁴ The evidence is conveniently gathered by M. R. James, "The Apocryphal Ezekiel", *JTS* 15 (1914), 236-243, 236-324, and *The Lost Apocrypha of the OT* (London, 1920), 64-70. Cf. Lightfoot I, 2, 39f. See also below, p. 90f.

⁵ Knopf (*op. cit.*, p. 56) and Harnack *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, (p. 108) both regard the quotation as coming from an Apocryphon, though not necessarily that of Ezekiel.

As an alternative, however, it is also possible that Clement's text of the canonical Ezekiel contained lengthy interpolations which could account for the quotation.¹ Thus although it is difficult to allow that Clement is dependent upon our canonical sources for this quotation, no certainty may be attained as to the exact non-canonical source he may have used. Yet a further possibility, the use of an anthology of quotations by Clement, has been suggested by R. M. Grant.²

(4) Cl. 17.6

This short quotation, introduced with *καὶ πάλιν λέγει* (following a quotation from Exodus), reads: *ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι ἀτμὶς ἀπὸ κύθρας*. It is elsewhere found only in Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 106, 4) where it is almost certainly dependent upon our quotation (the only variant being *χύτρας* for *κύθρας*). There are no very close canonical parallels, although some passages contain resemblances as for example, Ho. 13.3 *ὡς ἀτμὶς ἐκ καπνοδοχῆς* (thus A, with Theodotion; B reads *ὡς ἀτμὶς ἀπὸ δακρύων*); and in the NT, Jas. 4.14 *ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστε ἢ πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη, ἔπειτα καὶ ἀφανιζομένη*. The similarities, however, are very general and hardly can account for Clement's quotation which, moreover, seems to come from the mouth of Moses. J. R. Harris found that the Syriac of 1 Ch. 29.15 contained the comparable midrashic sentence "And we are comparable to the smoke of a pot", and from this fact drew the conclusion that Clement's quotation was derived from 1 Chronicles, "in a form agreeing closely with the Syriac version".³ Harris, however, was unable to explain how the Syriac reading made its way into Clement's Greek source.⁴ Furthermore, there is evidence that the metaphor was common

¹ Lightfoot prefers the explanation of an interpolated Ezekiel, and refers to other interpolated or expanded writings, as for example in the Greek Daniel and possibly Jeremiah. See I, 2, 39f. M. R. James while fully acknowledging the existence of the apocryphal Ezekiel, is also of the opinion that Clement's quotation may well derive from an interpolated canonical Ezekiel. "The Apocryphal Ezekiel", p. 242.

² *AF* II, 30. The contention of E. Werner, that the quotation is derived from a rabbinical source cannot be substantiated by the parallel he brings forward. "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the *Prima Clementis*", p. 795. It should not be forgotten that as given by Clement, the quotation is associated, albeit indirectly, with material drawn from Ezekiel (see above, p. 54).

³ "On an Obscure Quotation in the First Epistle of Clement", *JBL* 29 (1910), 190-195.

⁴ The difficulty of the ascription of the quotation to Moses (whereas in 1 Chronicles it is from David) was explained by Harris as an inadvertent displacement of the quotation from the end of the following chapter, which refers to David, to its present position. *Ibid.*, p. 194. No MS evidence supports this conjectured displacement.

in the ancient world,¹ and this could readily account for its presence both in the Syriac version of 1 Chronicles and in Clement's source. The most probable explanation of the quotation is that Clement has derived it from some apocryphal source no longer extant.² Since the words are probably attributed to Moses, a possible source is the *Assumption of Moses*.³ Alternatively, Lightfoot suggested *Eldad and Modad* as more certainly known at Rome.⁴ These, however, remain mere possibilities and the real source of the quotation remains unknown.⁵

(5) Cl. 23.3f.

The text of this long quotation in Clement reads :⁶

ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι, οἱ διατάζοντες τὴν ψυχὴν, οἱ λέγοντες · ταῦτα ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ, γεγηράκαμεν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συνβέβηκεν. ὦ ἀνόητοι, συμβάλετε ἑαυτοὺς ξύλῳ · λάβετε ἄμπελον · πρῶτον μὲν φυλλοροεῖ, εἴτα βλαστὸς γίνεται, εἴτα φύλλον, εἴτα ἄνθος, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὄμφαξ, εἴτα σταφυλὴ παρεστηκυῖα.

This quotation, which is introduced with the words ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη, ὅπου λέγει is found neither in our canonical books nor in extant apocryphal books. Resemblances to NT passages can be pointed out (e.g. Jas. 1.8 [δίψυχος]; 2 Pet. 3.4; Mk. 4.26ff; 13.28f. and parallels), but these present similarities in idea rather than verbal similarities.⁷ The quota-

¹ See Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 72, for the collected references. Cf. Lightfoot I, 2, 65.

² Thus Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 110. Grant, *AF* II, 40f. Werner's suggestion that Clement is dependent upon Midrash is unconvincing. "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis", p. 795f. Clement appears to connect the saying with Moses, and the words of 17.5 are probably dependent upon Exodus (see above, p. 56).

³ Thus Hilgenfeld, *Clementis Romani Epistulae* (Lipsiae, 1876), p. 23; cf. 127. Cf. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 72. See below, p. 88f.

⁴ I, 2, 65 and 80. See further, below, p. 87f.

⁵ J. Donaldson notes "It would be useless to enumerate the conjectures which have been made with regard to this passage from the time of Chrysostom to the present day. They leave the reader where they find him". *The Apostolical Fathers* (London, 1874), p. 183.

⁶ The text given is that of A; C differs in having τῇ ψυχῇ for τὴν ψυχὴν after διατάζοντες, and in omitting the words πρῶτον μὲν φυλλοροεῖ after ἄμπελον. The versions follow A in including the latter words.

⁷ The introductory formula (never used by Clement in referring to NT writings) also rules out dependence here. Harnack correctly writes "Da die als 'die Schrift' zitiert ist, war sie jüdisch und nicht christlich". *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 111. Cf. also E. Nestle who stresses the Jewishness of the source. *Op. cit.*, p. 180. There are also parallels in Epictetus, *Discourses* I, 14, 3; I, 15, 7f.

tion is, however, found almost exactly¹ in 2 Cl. 11.2ff., where it is introduced with the words λέγει γὰρ καὶ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος. Yet in 2 Clement our quotation is but part of a larger quotation, which continues with the following words: οὕτως καὶ ὁ λαὸς μου ἀκαταστασίας καὶ θλίψεις ἔσχεν · ἔπειτα ἀπολήφεται τὰ ἀγαθὰ. Unless these words were added by the author of 2 Clement, which seems improbable, it would appear that 2 Clement is very probably not dependent upon 1 Clement (as he elsewhere clearly is) but rather that the passage serves as an independent witness to the source used by Clement. It is difficult to identify what that source may have been. Possibly, as Lightfoot conjectures, it was the book called *Eldad and Modad*.² In any event it seems probable that this or some similar apocryphal writing constitutes the source upon which Clement is dependent.³

(6) Cl. 29.3

Since this quotation finds some parallels in the canonical writings,

¹ 2 Clement (text according to Lightfoot) differs from 1 Clement in the following: τῇ καρδίᾳ for τὴν ψυχὴν; the insertion of πάντα in ταῦτα ἠκούσαμεν; the substitution of ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας προσδεχόμενοι οὐδὲν τούτων ἐωράκαμεν for the sentence καὶ ἰδοὺ, γεγηράκαμεν ... συνβέβηκεν; the omission of ὃ before ἀνόητοι; and the omission of the words εἴτα φύλλον, εἴτα ἄνθος καί.

² See below, p. 87f. Lightfoot calls attention to the explicit mention of this writing in Hermas' *Shepherd* (*Vis.* II, 3, 4) where the quotation given is similar in purport to Clement's quotation, I, 2, 80f. Cf. also material similar to Clement's quotation in *Vis.* III, 4, 3 and *Mand.* IX. M. R. James has refused Lightfoot's conjecture, however, arguing that the saying fits poorly into the period of Eldad and Modad as described in Nu. 11. "The people have not been long in the wilderness—not long enough, it seems to me, to make it appropriate that they should say 'we have grown old in looking for the fulfilment of the promises'. Such language would be more fitting in the mouth of Israel when in exile and hoping for the Return". James therefore favours apocryphal Ezekiel as the source of the passage. *The Lost Apocrypha of the OT*, p. 40; cf. p. 68. Anachronisms, however, are fairly common in late pseudepigrapha, and there seems no reason why this may not so be regarded. Knoch also traces the *δυφυχία* motif of our quotation to the Apocalypse of Eldad and Modad. *Op. cit.*, p. 122. Elsewhere he is content to speak of "einen wohl christlich überarbeiteten apokryphen Vorlage". *Ibid.*, p. 134.

³ Knopf speaks simply of "ein apokryphen Buch, das unter alt. Flagge ging und vermutlich jüdischen Ursprungs war". *Op. cit.*, p. 86. Cf. Grant, *AF* II, 49; and Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 111. Daniélou finds the source in an "apocryphe judéo-chrétien". *Op. cit.*, p. 420; cf. 120. E. Werner is highly critical of Daniélou's contention that the term *δίφυχος* is "characteristic of ancient Christian spirituality", arguing instead that it is Jewish. "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis", p. 796f. No one would deny, least of all Daniélou, that ancient Christian spirituality is heavily dependent upon Jewish tradition.

it may perhaps equally well have been discussed together with the composite quotations. Yet apart from the parallel to the first part of the quotation, the similarities are not close, and it thus seems not improbable that a non-canonical source underlies the quotation. The opening section of the quotation and its parallel are as follows.

<i>Clement</i>	<i>LXX (Dt. 4.34; A and B; X, deficient)</i>
ἰδοῦ, κύριος	εἰ ἐπείρασεν ὁ θεὸς εἰσελθῶν
λαμβάνει ἑαυτῷ	λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ
ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου ἐθνῶν	ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου ἔθνους

Comparable passages are also found in Dt. 14.2 and 7.6 (cf. Acts 15.14), but the wording is somewhat different. Thus far the quotation looks as if it could easily have been a free citation of the Deuteronomy passage, in much the same way that Clement elsewhere cites freely. But for the remainder of the quotation, canonical parallels are not close. Clement's text continues: ὥσπερ λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος τὴν ἀπαρχὴν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἄλλω · καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους ἐκείνου ἅγια ἁγίων. Similar to these words in many points is the passage in Ezk. 48.12 (text of Rahlfs) καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῖς ἡ ἀπαρχὴ δεδομένη ἐκ τῶν ἀπαρχῶν τῆς γῆς, ἅγιον ἁγίων ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων τῶν λευιτῶν. In addition, we may compare 2 Ch. 31.14 δοῦναι τὰς ἀπαρχὰς κυρίῳ καὶ τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων (cf. also Nu. 18.27). It is possible that Clement is here confusing the canonical passages by quoting from memory, as he elsewhere does.¹ On the other hand, the variant passages needed to explain the quotation in this way are several in number and not very related in content. Since Clement elsewhere quotes from non-canonical writings, it may well be that he is also doing so here, as the introductory formula ἐν ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει may suggest.² Again, however, it is impossible to arrive at any certain conclusion concerning Clement's source.

(7) Cl. 34.8

This quotation is closely related to Is. 64.3 and would, under normal

¹ Thus Gebhardt and Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 49. Cf. Lightfoot, who, however, also allows the possibility of an apocryphal source. I, 2, 95.

² Knopf writes that our passage "ist eine merkwürdig zusammen gewürfelte und ungenaue Anführung; wenn sie Clemens an einen Orte las, muss sie in einen verlorenen Apokryphon gestanden haben". He rightly adds, however, "Aber diese Annahme ist natürlich nicht nötig, es kann gedächtnismässige Vermischung vorliegen". *Op. cit.*, p. 94. Cf. Grant, *AF* II, 55. Daniélou prefers to find the source of the quotation among early Jewish Christian *targumim* (Greek). *Op. cit.*, p. 120f. See below, p. 91f.

circumstances, have been explained simply as a variant quotation of that passage. The form of the quotation, however, agrees almost exactly with the quotation as found in 1 Cor. 2.9. Since it is certain that Clement was familiar with 1 Corinthians, it is natural to assume that he has borrowed the quotation from the latter. It is, of course, not impossible that Clement and Paul may be dependent upon a common source (which would then have to be non-canonical).¹ Yet such an explanation is both difficult and unnecessary.²

(8) Cl. 46.2

Clement's text reads : γέγραπται γάρ · κολλᾶσθε τοῖς ἁγίοις, ὅτι οἱ κολλῶμενοι αὐτοῖς ἁγιασθήσονται. This short quotation is found neither in the OT nor in non-canonical writings known to us. A similar idea is found in Sir. 6.34 : καὶ τίς σοφός ; αὐτῷ προσκολληθήτι, but can hardly account for the quotation in Clement. There are certain passages in Hermas' *Shepherd* which probably reflect the same saying : *Vis.* III, 6, 2 (some MSS) μηδὲ κολλῶμενοι τοῖς ἁγίοις ; *Sim.* VIII, 8, 1, καὶ μὴ κολλῶμενοι τοῖς ἁγίοις ; and *Sim.* IX, 20, 2, οὐ κολλῶνται τοῖς δούλοις τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. also Did. 5.2 : οὐ κολλῶμενοι ἀγαθῷ οὐδὲ κρίσει δικαίᾳ. Clement's quotation is even more closely paralleled in Clement of Alexandria where it is linked together with the quotation which follows in the Roman Clement. The Alexandrian Clement's text reads : κολλᾶσθαι οὖν τοῖς ἁγίοις προσήκει, ὅτι οἱ κολλῶμενοι αὐτοῖς ἁγιασθήσονται (*Stromata* V, 52, 3).³ While Hermas may witness to an independent knowledge of the maxim, it is almost certain that Clement of Alexandria, in customary fashion, is dependent upon his Roman namesake.⁴ Since the idea of "cleaving to the good" was apparently common in the early Church (cf. the Didache ; Hermas ; Rom. 12.9), it is conceivable that the saying was derived from a current proverb. The ethical impulse of the Church

¹ Origen and others regarded the quotation as being derived from the Apocalypse of Elias.

² For a discussion of the passage, as well as a juxtaposition of the texts, see below, p. 204ff.

³ Stählin puts only the last portion of the sentence (beginning with ὅτι) in quotation marks, thus apparently regarding the earlier portion as the Alexandrian's own formulation.

⁴ Lightfoot writes that "the change of form suggests that the Alexandrian Clement did not recognise the source of the quotation in his Roman namesake". I, 2, 140. Lightfoot also indicated the presence of the quotation in Nikon (a seventeenth century Russian monk), but it is difficult to know of what significance this may be. See also M. R. James, *The Lost Apocrypha of the OT*, p. 88.

here stands clearly in close contact with that of Hellenistic Judaism.¹ The formulaic use of *γέγραπται*, however, makes it probable that Clement derived the saying from some apocryphal writing.²

In summarizing the findings of this chapter, we may first emphasize that the great majority of OT quotations in Clement's epistle are given in very close accord with the LXX text. While it is true to say that actual verbatim quotations are few, the variants found in most of Clement's quotations are slight, and their presence suggests that Clement's text as found in A is essentially trustworthy and has not been thoroughly harmonized to agree with the LXX (although this may occasionally be seen to happen) as, for example, the text of C and the versions have.

What may be said concerning the text of the quotations, especially that of the essentially verbatim quotations? Unfortunately, as we have seen, it is virtually impossible to establish any general textual affinities with the major texts of the LXX. In a number of places Clement's text agrees with particular readings of A, in others with readings of B or κ . Similarly, variants in Clement's quotations can often be paralleled in various cursive MSS when Holmes and Parsons is consulted. However, the witnesses listed in the critical apparatus of the latter work present a very bewildering picture,³ and thus it is difficult to know what their significance may be.⁴ Thus the textual situation reflected in Clement is very complex, indeed. While an occasional oddity may be noted (e.g. the agreement with LXX C in 57.3-7; the agreement with κ in 39.3-9; a Theodotonic reading in 34.6), no pattern

¹ See E. Werner, "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis", p. 803f.

² Thus Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 121. Grant, *AF* II, 76. See below, p. 89f.

³ Katz, referring to the apparatus in Holmes and Parsons, and Brooke-McLean, says that the painstaking scholar there encounters "‘but a roaring sea of variants’, in which cabin boy and master mariner alike perish; for the number of seamen able to navigate this material is small". "The Recovery of the Original Septuagint, A Study in the History of Transmission and Textual Criticism", *Actes du premier Congrès de la Fédération internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques* (Paris, 1951), p. 167.

⁴ Stählin, researching the quotations in Clement of Alexandria, found this quest equally frustrating. "Es könnte vielleicht scheinen, als ob auf den vorstehenden Blättern die Hss bei Holmes-Parsons nicht genügend berücksichtigt worden waren... Aber es ist dies vor allem der Kürze wegen unterlassen worden, und wozu sollte z. B. die Anführung von 70 oder 100 Hss nummern bei den Psalmen dienen, wenn doch kein Resultat daraus zu gewinnen ist?" *Clemens Alexandrinus und die Septuaginta* (Nürnberg, 1901), p. 75.

emerges from the data afforded by the variants.¹ Swete drew the following general conclusions concerning the text of Clement's quotations: (1) it occasionally agrees with that of NT quotations, but also shows independence; (2) "while often supporting A, it is less constantly opposed to B than is the New Testament"; and (3) it occasionally agrees with Theodotion and Aquila against the LXX. Our investigation supports these conclusions, although we would perhaps want to phrase the second more positively, in that B is supported by Clement at least as often as is A. When Swete summarizes by saying that the text of the quotations "seems in fact to be a more mixed text than that which was in the hands of the Palestinian writers of the N.T.", he is without question on solid ground.²

It cannot be doubted that most of the slight variants from the LXX in the essentially verbatim quotations are the result of Clement's own hand, reflecting Clement's concern for smoothness of style and clarity of expression.³ Minor alterations of this nature are to be found in almost every quotation which we have examined. When variants cannot be explained on the basis of stylistic or allied motivations, if they are not inadvertent alterations, they may trace back to the LXX MS(S) Clement was using. These, however, we judge to be rare in the essentially verbatim quotations, and in any event, no emphasis may be put upon them.

The situation is somewhat different when we come to the moderately variant quotations. Here Clement appears either to be rendering the

¹ Rahlfs' judgement is correct: "Einfache Identifikation der von den ältesten Kirchenvätern gebrauchten Septuagintatexte mit den uns erhaltenen Texttypen ist nicht möglich. Daraus folgt wohl, dass es in ältester Zeit noch anderen Typen oder Nuancen gegeben hat. Doch lässt sich darüber bei der Dürftigkeit und Unsicherheit des Materials nichts Genauerers sagen". *Septuaginta-Studien* II, 210.

² The same kind of bewilderment is caused by the text-form of the early papyri. Thus Jellicoe writes "Those who would look to these papyri for definitive answers to textual problems, especially a ringing up of the curtain upon a carefully staged tableau of the pre-Origenian or pre-Lucianic-Hesychian days, will find as confused a presentation in the Chester Beatty scene as the one with which they were formerly familiar. Book for book the same phenomenon of variation is encountered; within the books, or parts of books represented, the same mixture of text-types is found, so that categories can be drawn, as with the major uncials and leading cursives, only in the most general of terms". *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford, 1968), p. 231.

³ Cf. Stählin, who similarly writes "Oft ist die Kenntnis der Sprachgebrauchs unseren Autors der einzige Maastab für die Entscheidung, ob eine LXX-Lesart oder eine Autorvariante vorliegt". *Clemens Alexandrinus und die Septuaginta*, p. 11.

materials freely, actively reshaping them according to his own purpose or context, or perhaps quoting, not altogether accurately, from memory. Accordingly, the quotations cannot fairly be taken as accurate indication of Clement's LXX text. This is all the more true since the quotations all (except 8.2, where Ezekiel is quoted) derive from books from which Clement also quotes exactly elsewhere.

In the case of composite quotations and "non-septuagintal" or variant quotations, it is questionable whether the LXX or some other source underlies the form of the text found in Clement. A number of these seem to give indication of having been derived from memory; in other instances a non-canonical source seems probable. That the latter suggestion is more than hypothetical is underlined by the clear presence of non-canonical quotations in Clement's epistle. In the chapter which follows we consider the possible alternative sources which the phenomena in Clement's epistle may suggest.

CHAPTER THREE

POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS OF VARIANT QUOTATIONS

Our concern in the present chapter is not with quotations which exhibit only slight variants when compared with our manuscripts of the LXX. These quotations are patently from the LXX, although it is not always clear when a variant reading is to be taken as accurately reflecting Clement's LXX, when Clement deliberately makes minor changes, or when the alteration is an inadvertence in an otherwise exactly memorized quotation. Instead, we are concerned with the quotations which are more markedly variant. How are these quotations and composite quotations to be accounted for? We shall here briefly examine the more likely possibilities which can be suggested in answer to this question. We shall primarily look at possible alternative sources, attempting to assess their suitability in accounting for the variant quotations, but we shall also look at the possible role that memory may play in these quotations. This chapter is thus based upon and presupposes the detailed examination of the quotations in the preceding chapter.

A. DIFFERING GREEK TRANSLATIONS

Since Clement betrays no knowledge of Hebrew or Aramaic in his epistle, we need not look to the Massoretic (or other Hebrew) Text or to Aramaic Targums as possible sources of Clement's variant quotations. As we have seen, when the LXX differs from the MT, Clement invariably follows the former against the latter. Consequently it seems safe to say that any Hebrew or Aramaic influences upon the text of Clement's quotations are indirect, perhaps mediated through Greek sources, whether oral or written.¹

¹ This we judge to be the case with the *καταστροφή* in Clement's citation of Ps. 138.7-10 in 28.3, and *φύβον* in Pr. 1.29 in 57.5. The same must be said for certain Semitic expressions which are found in the quotations (e.g. *γινώσκουσα γινώσκω* in Cl. 12.5). Cf. E. Nestle, "War der Verfasser des ersten Clemens-Briefes semitischen Abstammung?" pp. 178-180; and E. Werner, "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis", p. 814f.

But once we have established that the source of Clement's quotations was a Greek source, we have not thereby solved the problems which confront us. For in addition to various textual traditions of the LXX, a number of Greek translations or targums independent of the LXX tradition may well have been in circulation in Clement's day.

The availability and importance of a multiplicity of Greek translations of OT writings in the first century has been vigorously argued by P. Kahle.¹ Kahle has attempted to invert the theory of LXX origins held by Lagarde and his successors which traces the various recensions of the LXX back to a single, original *Urtext*. Finding hints of earlier Greek translations in the Letter of Aristeas (§ 30), Kahle maintains that in reality the letter refers not to the original translation of the Pentateuch into Greek, but is instead an apologetic for the standardization of the text of a number of varying extempore Greek translations.²

In accordance with this theory, Kahle is disposed to interpret the early evidence of Greek texts which differ from the received LXX, not as descendants (whether by corruption or recension) of an original Proto-Septuagint (thus Lagarde, Rahlfs, and successors), but rather as evidence of the survival of non-septuagintal translations. He thus makes much of the apparent presence of Lucianic readings³ in the earliest extant fragments of the OT in Greek, the John Rylands Papyrus Greek 458 (from Dt. 22-28; second century BC). Similarly, fragments from Greek texts (from Leviticus and Numbers) found in Qumran Cave 4 display a text which contains non-septuagintal readings, as does the leather scroll of the Minor Prophets (the Dodekapropheton Scroll), which again contains Lucianic readings. The text form of quotations in Josephus and Philo are also taken by Kahle to show the influence of a non-septuagintal Greek tradition, as are the quotations in the NT which vary from the LXX.

¹ *The Cairo Geniza*² (Oxford, 1959), pp. 209-264; "Problems of the Septuagint", *Studia Patristica* I, TU 63 (Berlin, 1957), pp. 328-338; "Die Septuaginta: Prinzipielle Erwägungen", *Festschrift Otto Eissfeldt* (Halle, 1947), 161-180. Cf. also the work of Kahle's pupil A. Sperber, "The Problems of the Septuagint Recensions", *JBL* 54 (1935), 73-92; and "New Testament and Septuagint", *JBL* 59 (1940), 193-293.

² *The Cairo Geniza*², p. 212ff. Kahle finds further evidence for early (non-septuagintal) Greek translations in a passage from Aristobulus preserved in Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* I, 150, 1ff.) and Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.* 13, 12). *Ibid.*, p. 221f. Swete, who gives the pertinent text, finds nothing of historical value in it. *An Introduction to the OT in Greek*, p. 1f.

³ On the Lucianic text see B. M. Metzger, "The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible", *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden, 1963), pp. 1-41.

There is no need for our present purposes to enter into argument with Kahle or to become involved in the question of LXX origins. This has been done often enough in the past,¹ and Kahle has failed to convince many students of the subject.² He not only cannot produce evidence which clearly substantiates this theory, but more important than that, the evidence upon which he does base his hypothesis is capable of being explained in other ways.³ Indeed, the mainstay of Kahle's position is the analogy of the Aramaic Targums and other versions.

Nevertheless, this analogy has a certain amount of plausibility and is to some extent confirmed by the variations even within the LXX text of certain writings of the OT.⁴ Thus for Judges, the LXX texts of A

¹ See especially H. M. Orlinsky, "On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies", *JAOS* 61 (1941), 81-91. Orlinsky's conclusion, representative of the main stream of LXX research, is perhaps worth giving here in full:

"I. Lagarde's principles, plausible enough *a priori*, have been found to be essentially sound in the inductive works of men like Rahlfs, Montgomerie, and Margolis.

II. The new pertinent MS data, such as the Chester Beatty, Rylands, and Scheide papyri, seem to push back the problem of recension and of the Proto-Septuagint chronologically nearer to its date of composition; they do not alter the problem.

III. The criticism levelled against the Lagardian theory by Kahle-Sperber have neither refuted anything nor do they have any positive basis whatever in themselves". *Ibid.*, p. 90f. Cf. also Orlinsky's "Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research", *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, ed. H. R. Willoughby (Chicago, 1947), pp. 144-161.

² See e.g., P. Katz, "The Recovery of the Original Septuagint", pp. 165-182 = "Das Problem des Urtextes der Septuaginta", *TZ* 5 (1949), 1-24; "Septuagintal Studies in the Mid-Century", *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 176-208. Cf. also the following writers who differ with Kahle: S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, pp. 59-63; B. J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff, 1951), pp. 111-115; K. Stendhal, *The School of St. Matthew*, pp. 174-182; E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the OT*, pp. 17-20; R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the OT in St. Matthew's Gospel*, pp. 166-171.

³ In particular, it is interesting to contrast Kahle's interpretation of the Dodekapropheton Scroll with that of D. Barthélemy "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante", *RB* 60 (1953), 18-29. Cf. also Katz, "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll", *Studia Patristica* I, TU 63 (Berlin, 1957), 343-353. Also to be noted is Katz's explanation of Philo's quotations on the basis of a later interpolator, against Kahle's view of Philo's use of early non-septuagintal translations. P. Katz, *Philo's Bible* (Cambridge, 1950).

⁴ B. J. Roberts says of the LXX that "throughout its history free transmission was always one of its characteristic features, and, despite attempts to fix a standard form, there appears to have been no recension for which the claim was made that it was an authoritative text". "The Old Testament: Manuscripts, Texts, and Versions", *CHB*, II, ed. G. W. H. Lampe, (Cambridge, 1969), p. 18.

and B are quite divergent and suggest the possibility of independent origins.¹ The same kind of phenomenon is seen in the relation between the text of 1 Esdras and that contained in the LXX's Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah,² as well as in the contrasting recensions of Tobit in α and B³ (cf. also those of Esther, Job, Proverbs and Ezekiel).⁴ Many of these revised editions are doubtless later attempts to bring the Greek text into closer conformity with the MT, rather than being original translations parallel to one another. In the case of Daniel, the Church adopted the translation of Theodotion (second century AD) in preference to the earlier version which had been handed down and which diverged very considerably from the MT. However, because certain Theodotonic readings are found already in the NT and early Fathers, it seems that Theodotion himself made use of an earlier version, which has been called *Ur-Theodotion*, and thus the possibility of two original translations at the very beginning is raised.⁵ Similarly, the existence of Lucianic readings prior to Lucian's recension⁶ indicates that this also was not a *de novo* enterprise, but reflects a version of considerable antiquity.⁷

These data, when combined with the *a priori* probability of a multiplicity of Greek translations, make Kahle's contention worth considering even if the implications he draws for the question of LXX origins be rejected.⁸ Kahle has suggested that evidence of the earlier Greek versions can be traced in the commonly accepted recensions of the LXX; the older translations made from the Greek OT; the remains of

¹ Kahle thus argues that these two texts are "typical examples" of the ancient Targums, *The Cairo Geniza*², p. 236. Jellicoe, however, counters that "the one has used the other, or both stem from a common archetype". *Op. cit.*, p. 280f.

² See a discussion of the theories in Jellicoe, *op. cit.*, p. 290ff. Cf. especially R. H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times* (London, 1949), pp. 246-250.

³ See Jellicoe, *op. cit.*, p. 295f.

⁴ See the various sections in Swete and Jellicoe. We may also mention the anonymous translation of OT portions known via Origen as Quinta, Sexta and Septima, and the translations known via fourth and fifth century patristic sources as from "the Hebrew" and "the Syrian". Cf. B. J. Roberts, *The OT Text and Versions*, p. 127.

⁵ A full discussion can be found in Jellicoe, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-94.

⁶ The evidence is conveniently gathered in Metzger, "The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible", pp. 31-35.

⁷ "Whereas Josephus' text takes the Lucianic back to the first century A.D., with the Rylands Papyrus which represents a similar type, 'Lucian' recedes into the Maccabean era". Jellicoe, *op. cit.*, p. 290; cf. pp. 163ff.; 346ff.

⁸ Roberts rightly questions whether "the existence of other Greek versions necessarily precludes the existence of the Septuagint as a recognized version in the time immediately before the NT". *CHB* II, 16.

the Hexapla; and "in quotations from the Greek Old Testament which are found in the New Testament and in other writings from the first two centuries B.C., in so far as they do not conform with the Christian standard text".¹ Since this latter criterion is applicable to a number of Clement's more variant quotations, it is perhaps worth asking whether Clement may not witness to the use of Greek translations other than those of the commonly received LXX.

The first thing which one looks for in attempting to ascertain the possible use of alternative translations is whether the variant quotations are restricted to any one of the books which are quoted. In Clement's epistle, however, all of the moderately variant and variant quotations come from writings which are also quoted in very close agreement with our LXX MSS, with the one exception of Ezk. 33.11 (Cl. 8.2.) This does not, of course, make it impossible that the variant quotations derive from non-septuagintal translations—since independent translations may also agree—but it does make this explanation quite unlikely.²

Among the essentially verbatim quotations, few variants occur which are not readily explainable as slight modifications for stylistic reasons on Clement's part. Among these, the *πυρὸς φλόγα* of 36.3 (Ps. 103.4) and *θεός* of 30.2 (Pr. 3.34) are in all probability the result of influence from the respective NT writings where the same quotations occur. In a few further instances we encounter variants which appear possibly to be derived from a non-septuagintal source. Thus *ὡς λέων* in 35.11 (Ps. 49.22) is found elsewhere, according to Rahlfs, in R (the sixth century Greek and Latin Verona Psalter), in the old Latin Psalter of St. Germain-des-Prés (sixth century), in the Syriac translation of Paul of Tella (seventh century) and in minuscule 184, apparently connected with Theodoret (fifth century).³ This variant, however, can hardly be counted as evidence that Clement used a different translation of the Psalter. The words *ὡς λέων* are doubtless to be explained on the basis of Ps. 7.3 *μή ποτε ἀρπάσῃ ὡς λέων τὴν ψυχὴν μου*, from which passage they have in all probability been imported either by a

¹ *The Cairo Geniza*², p. 262.

² Cf. O. Michel's similar criticism of Vollmer's attempt to explain the aberrant quotations in Paul on the basis of a non-septuagintal Greek translation. *Paulus und seine Bibel*, p. 67.

³ See *Septuaginta-Studien* II, 200; *Psalmi cum Odis*, Septuaginta Societatis Scientiarum Gottingensis (Göttingen, 1931), p. 163.

scribal gloss or by memory.¹ A similar phenomenon seems to underlie Clement's addition of the words *καὶ πόνω* in 16.3 (Is. 53.3) which are also found in a few cursive MSS and Origen.² They have quite probably been added by a scribe from the words *ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν πόνω* found in the following verse (Is. 53.4). Another variant which may be mentioned is Clement's substitution of *φόβον τοῦ κυρίου* for *λόγον τοῦ κυρίου* in 57.5 (Pr. 1.29) in which Clement agrees with C (Ephraemi; fifth or sixth century) and the seventh century corrector of α . It seems that Clement here followed a LXX MS which had been corrected to agree with the MT's *יִרְאָה יְהוָה*. The quotation otherwise agrees so closely with the LXX that a different Greek version is virtually impossible.

More likely evidence for the use of non-septuagintal translations is perhaps to be found in the moderately variant quotations. In these quotations, however, while some of the variants may occasionally be paralleled among the later MSS listed in the apparatus of Holmes and Parsons, no evidence can be brought forward which points to their existence as early as the first century. Comparison with the Hexaplaric fragments yields no evidence for the variants. Moreover, when one takes into account the early popularity of Clement's epistle, it is far from impossible that the form of Clement's quotation may have influenced certain later scribes of the LXX.

As we have already noted, the only writing quoted in variant or even in "non-septuagintal" form, which is also not quoted exactly, is Ezekiel (33.11 in Cl. 8.2). Here the possibility of an alternative Greek translation underlying Clement's quotation is attractive. At the same time, the variant *τὴν μετάνοιαν*, because of its importance to the context, looks as though it could be Clement's own substitution for the words of the LXX. Otherwise, the quotation is in close agreement with the LXX. In addition to this, as we shall see, the use of an apocryphal Ezekiel is also a possibility.

It is, in fact, the existence of other possible sources that makes our task so difficult. For even when we have once allowed that the source is not the LXX—a point which due to the possible use of memory and paraphrase always remains open to question—we are faced with several alternatives. We may have, in addition to a Greek translation inde-

¹ Thus also Lightfoot I, 2, 110.

² See Ziegler, *Isaias*, Septuaginta ... Soc. Litt. Gottingensis XIV (Göttingen, 1939), p. 53.

pendent of the LXX, a canonical book of the LXX containing interpolations,¹ the use of a current oral targum,² or a non-canonical writing resembling, and perhaps in part dependent upon, a related canonical writing.

We conclude, then, that the aberrant quotations in Clement's epistle cannot substantiate Kahle's hypothesis concerning a multiplicity of Greek translations of various OT writings. It is possible that in a few instances Clement's quotations may depend upon differing translations, but any suggestion that this is the explanation of the aberrant quotations remains conjectural, and indeed appears improbable in the light of the further possibilities which are now to be discussed.

B. UNKNOWN WRITINGS

That Clement's sources are by no means limited to canonical writings is plain from the presence of quotations from Wisdom as well as from those quotations which lack canonical parallels.³ Attention was called to this non-canonical material, some of which is introduced as scripture, as early as the ninth century by Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who wrote of 2 Clement: *ρήτά τινα ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς θείας γραφῆς ξενίζοντα παρεισάγει*, adding *ὧν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη ἀπήλλακτο παντελῶς* (*Bibliotheca* 126).⁴ The sources of this "foreign" material to which Photius refers, have still not been exactly determined.

The quotations in question are among those which have been discussed above under the heading "Non-canonical Quotations". Two of these (3.4; 27.5) are from Wisdom, and a third (34.8) is apparently from 1 Corinthians. For the remaining five quotations the source remains questionable. For two of these latter quotations (8.3; 29.3) it is possible to gather a number of canonical parallels and to explain

¹ Lightfoot, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, seems to favour this hypothesis in a number of places.

² For the suggestion of early Hellenistic oral Targums, see Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, p. 50. For the argument of written Jewish *targumim* (Greek), see Daniélou, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-111.

³ Van Unnik has also called attention to the possible influence of extra-canonical Palestinian-Jewish sources in Cl. 20, a chapter usually explained as exclusively dependent upon Stoic sources. See "Is 1 Clement 20 Purely Stoic?" *VC* 4 (1950), especially p. 185f. for possible parallels.

⁴ The text is conveniently found in Migne, *PG*, vol. 103, col. 408.

the quotations as mosaics composed of these materials. In both instances, however, this is a rather laboured explanation, and it is more in keeping with Clement's customary exactness of quotation to suppose that here he had before him non-canonical sources which are no longer extant. This conclusion seems more probable in view of the three quotations which lack canonical parallels (17.6; 23.3f; 46.2), and which are thus to be explained on the basis of alternative sources.

Of the various conjectures which have been made concerning these sources, the most convincing is that made for 23.3f. by Lightfoot, who suggested that the book *Eldad and Modad* could well account for the quotation.¹ Little, in fact, is known of this book, which is attested in Hermas, *Vis.* II, 3, 4, the Stichometry of Nicephorus (400 στίχοι) and in the Pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis (where it is included among apocryphal books of the NT), but which has not endured to modern times. The names Eldad and Modad are found in Nu. 11.26-29 where it is said that they, having not gone out to the tent, prophesied in the camp. The writing which bore their names was probably a late pseudepigraphal book designed to meet the needs of a contemporary situation by putting the intended message in the form of an ancient prophecy.²

Some idea of the content of the book can be gathered from the passage in the *Shepherd* of Hermas. In *Vis.* II, 3, 4 Hermas writes: ἐγγὺς κύριος τοῖς ἐπιστρεφόμενοις, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἑλδὰδ καὶ Μοδάδ, τοῖς προφητεύουσιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ. The fact that the Jerusalem Targums supply as the prophecy of Eldad and Modad in Nu. 11 a similar message (concerning tribulation in the pre-Messianic days) suggests that they witness to the same source.³

This, in fact, agrees well with the content of our quotation as found in Clement, and also as found in 2 Cl. 11.2f. This latter passage, as we have seen, agrees with 1 Clement except for some slight changes and the addition of a further sentence in the quotation: οὕτως καὶ ὁ λαός μου ἀκαταστασίας καὶ θλίψεις ἔσχεν · ἔπειτα ἀπολήψεται τὰ ἀγαθά.

¹ Lightfoot, I, 2, 80f. For the text of the quotation, see above, p. 73. A. Resch prefers the suggestion of an apocryphal Ezekiel as the source of the quotation. *Agrapha*² TU 30 (Leipzig, 1906), p. 325. M. R. James agrees with Resch, against Lightfoot, arguing that the context of the story of Eldad and Modad ill befits the point of the present quotation. *The Lost Apocrypha of the OT*, p. 40.

² "The fact that the prophecies of these men are unrecorded in Nu. 11.26-29 furnished an inviting theme for imagination to some unknown seer and author". J. T. Marshall "Eldad and Modad, Book of" *HDB* I, 676.

³ Thus J. T. Marshall, *ibid.*

This added sentence shows that 2 Clement is not dependent upon 1 Clement for the quotation and that both quotations go back to the same source. The added sentence agrees well with what is known of *Eldad and Modad* from Hermas. Moreover, in 2 Clement the quotation is introduced as ὁ προφητικός λόγος, a formula which would particularly suit the prophetic *Eldad and Modad*. Also to be noted is the reference to οἱ δίδυχοι in the quotations found in both 1 and 2 Clement. While this word does not appear in the quotation of *Vis.* II, 3, 4, the same root is in the immediate context (*Vis.* II, 2, 4 and 7),¹ thereby providing further support for the connection between the quotations in 1 and 2 Clement and *Eldad and Modad* mentioned by Hermas.² Yet a further factor which adds some plausibility to the argument is that the *Shepherd*, like Clement's epistle, and possibly also 2 Clement, was written at Rome, thereby assuring that the early Roman Church was acquainted with *Eldad and Modad*.

Thus although there can be no certainty concerning the source of Clement's quotation, there are a number of indications which make it probable that Clement is here citing *Eldad and Modad* under the rubric ἡ γραφή αὕτη.³

For the other quotations in question, we must be content with pure conjecture. An attractive suggestion, however, for the quotation in 17.6 ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι ἀτμὶς ἀπὸ κύθρας, has been made by Hilgenfeld, who suggests as its source the *Assumption of Moses*.⁴ A considerable portion of this book survives in Latin translation in a sixth century MS.⁵ It contains a Testament of Moses—an account of his parting words to Joshua, rather than an account of the assumption. Towards the end of the extant portion (chapter 11 and following, according to the numeration in Charles' edition) Moses speaks in the first person to Joshua, and it is not difficult to imagine Moses uttering the words of our quotation shortly after the extant MS breaks off.

¹ The word is frequently encountered in other parts of *Shepherd* (e.g. *Vis.* III, 2ff; IV, 1f; *Sim.* VIII, 7f; *Mand.* 9 and 10). Cf. also *Jas.* 1.8; 4.8.

² Cf. Lightfoot I, 2, 81.

³ For the possible significance of *γραφὴ* here, see below, p. 117f.

⁴ Hilgenfeld, *Clementis Romani Epistulae*, p. 23. Resch agrees that an apocryphal book under Moses' name is the most likely source, but suggests also the possibility of an Ἀποκάλυψις Μωϋσέως. *Agrapha*², p. 309.

⁵ Text and introduction are available in R. H. Charles, *The Assumption of Moses* (London, 1897), and *id.*, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, II (Oxford, 1913), 407-424.

Thus the context of the *Assumption* is well suited to this alleged utterance of Moses. In addition to this, evidence exists that this writing was already well known in the first century,¹ although its early presence at Rome cannot be verified. Still, it is quite probable that the *Assumption* early made its way to Rome, and it is not improbable that Clement was acquainted with it.

Quite possibly, then, Clement borrowed the quotation from the *Assumption of Moses*. Lightfoot, however, is of the opinion that since in 23.3f. Clement appears to quote *Eldad and Modad*, there is no reason to go beyond that writing to explain the present quotation. It is conceivable that the latter writing contained such words of Moses; however, the context for the utterance is much more hypothetical there than the one which already exists in the *Assumption*. Given the present data, it is difficult to come to a final decision on the question, although it may be said that Lightfoot seems to underestimate the suitability of the *Assumption*.²

The third quotation which lacks canonical parallels is that found in Cl. 46.2, *κολλᾶσθε τοῖς ἁγίοις, ὅτι οἱ κολλῶμενοι αὐτοῖς ἀγιασθήσονται*. As noted above, Hermas seemed also to know this saying (cf. *Vis.* III, 6; *Sim.* VIII, 8; IX, 20). Were these words known to Hermas via *Eldad and Modad*? This is possible, but by no means necessary, since many non-canonical sources were available to writers in the second century. One can only conjecture as to what Clement's source may have been. The quotation, as we have seen, appears in Clement of Alexandria, slightly altered, but clearly dependent upon the Roman Clement. Similarity of thought is found in a few NT passages (e.g. Rom. 12.9; 1 Cor. 6.17; 7.14; Rev. 22.11). Building upon this latter evidence, Resch argued that in reality the quotation was a saying of Jesus derived from a *vorcanonischen Evangelienschrift*.³

¹ See Charles, *The Assumption of Moses*, pp. Lxiff; 106-110.

² Lightfoot, however, rightly rejects Hilgenfeld's argument that the *Assumption of Moses* begins with a chronological reference to the departure of the Phoenix. Hilgenfeld argued that Clement's reference to the Phoenix (chapter 25) was dependent upon the *Assumption* and therefore that our present quotation is derived from the *Assumption*. Even if the latter writing did refer to the Phoenix, dependence would by no means be proved, since the story was common in Jewish circles. In fact, however, the *Assumption* refers to *projectionis fynicis*, probably meaning, as Charles translates, "departure from Phoenicia". Lightfoot I, 2, 84ff. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT*, II, 414.

³ *Agrapha*¹, TU 5 (Leipzig, 1889), p. 169f.

J. H. Ropes argued, against Resch, that Clement's introductory formula, *γέγραπται*, would hardly have been used to introduce words of Jesus, and suggested instead that the saying was of pre-Christian origin, perhaps inspired by, and interpolated into, the LXX text of Ps. 17.26 (which is quoted immediately following by Clement) alongside the words *μετὰ δόσιου δσιωθησῇ*.¹ However, while Ropes is correct in emphasizing the *γέγραπται*, Resch is correct when in his second edition he points out that Ropes had failed to note the formula which is used to introduce the Psalm passage: *ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει*.² This second formula makes the contention that Clement derived our words from the (interpolated) Psalm passage improbable. We thus can accept neither Ropes' nor Resch's explanation of the quotation.

Despite the proverbial sound of the saying and the widespread knowledge of this or a very similar saying, we cannot explain it simply on the basis of a common proverb circulating orally in the early Church. Clement's *γέγραπται* points to a written source to which was probably ascribed some antiquity or authority. Lacking further indicators, we can say no more than that it appears to have been some apocryphal or pseudonymous writing which is no longer extant.

It is also difficult to determine the source of the remaining two quotations which we have designated "non-canonical". We have already discussed the parallels to the quotation in 8.3, and have suggested on the basis of the (probably independent) parallel in Clement of Alexandria which is attributed to "Ezekiel" that the quotation is derived from an apocryphal Ezekiel, or at the least from an interpolated canonical Ezekiel.³

Again, very little is known of pseudo-Ezekiel. The most important witness to it is found in Epiphanius *Haer.* 64 where, referring to τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰεζεκιήλ τοῦ προφήτου ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀποκρύφῳ ρηθέντα περὶ ἀναστάσεως, he presents a parable of the judgement of both body and soul. Specific mention of an apocryphal Ezekiel is found elsewhere only in the Stichometry of Nicephorus, where it is listed with a group at the end of the OT Apocrypha, without giving the number of the *stichoi*,

¹ *Die Sprüche Jesu*, TU 14 (Leipzig, 1896), p. 22f.

² *Agrapha*², p. 88f. Resch also tried to meet the difficulty posed by Clement's *γέγραπται* by remarking that in 1 Tim. 5.18 a saying of Jesus appears (combined with an OT quotation) which is introduced as *γραφῇ*. The formula may, however, refer only to the first half—the OT words—or the author may have believed that the latter words were derived from the OT.

³ See above, p. 69ff.

Βαρούχ, Ἀμβακούμ, Ἰεζεκιήλ καὶ Δανιήλ ψευδεπίγραφα. A non-canonical quotation is assigned simply to "Ezekiel" by Tertullian (*de carne Christi* 23), and is found also in Epiphanius (*Haer.* 30, 30), Gregory of Nyssa (*Adv. Iud.* 3), *Actus Petri cum Simone* 24, and Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* VII, 94, 2) where it is introduced as Scripture, *τέτοκεν καὶ οὐ τέτοκεν φησὶν ἡ γραφή.* Another saying attributed to Ezekiel, but not found in the canonical Ezekiel, occurs in *Vita S. Antonii* (fourth century, allegedly by Athanasius). These last two fragments, however, may possibly derive from an interpolated canonical Ezekiel rather than a pseudonymous Ezekiel.¹ Further evidence which can be brought forward as pointing towards an apocryphal Ezekiel is very dubious.²

Resch has argued strongly that our quotation derives from pseudo-Ezekiel, which he argues "war jedenfalls ein ursprünglich jüdisches, später christlich interpoliertes Werk."³ Although we know little of the contents of pseudo-Ezekiel, it is quite possible that Clement found the quotation in this writing. The association of the passage with the name of Ezekiel is clear from Clement of Alexandria. This seems also to be the conclusion which should be drawn from Clement's introductory words *προστιθεὶς καὶ γνώμην ἀγαθὴν*, which follow a passage which is quite probably derived from our canonical Ezekiel. If the latter passage is from the canonical Ezekiel, then perhaps Clement's *προστιθεὶς* supports Harnack's idea of an "apokryphen Zusatz zum Propheten Ezechiel".

We conclude it probable, but by no means certain, that our quotation was derived either from a pseudo-Ezekiel, or a canonical Ezekiel expanded by an appendix or by interpolations.

The final quotation which remains to be discussed is that in 29.3. We have already noted that, although conceivable, it is improbable that Clement has here combined various canonical passages from memory. Since there are no parallels to the quotation in the literature of the early Church, no additional clues to its source are available

¹ Harnack writes of the former quotation, "nach Tertullian stand die Stelle in einem apokryphen Zusatz zum Propheten Ezechiel. Es mag bereits eine jüdische Interpolation sein, die dann von den Christen auf Maria gedeutet worden ist". *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, I (Leipzig, 1897), p. 560f.

² This evidence is assessed by M. R. James, "The Apocryphal Ezekiel", p. 240ff; *idem*, *The Lost Apocrypha of the OT*, pp. 64-70; cf. also Resch, *Agrapha*¹, p. 290f.

³ *Agrapha*¹, p. 290f.; and with even more conviction in *Agrapha*², p. 327. Cf. James, "the source was Christian or Christianized". "The Apocryphal Ezekiel", p. 240.

outside the passage itself. The introductory formula is of no assistance since it consists only of the words *καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει*, following a quotation from Deuteronomy. Although the first part of the quotation is paralleled in Deuteronomy, it is difficult to believe that the quotation is from this book if only because of the introductory *ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ* (which elsewhere only introduces quotations which differ in source from those which they follow [8.4; 46.3]). The second part of the quotation resembles, as we have already noted, a passage in Ezekiel, and this immediately suggests the possibility that Clement may have derived this quotation from the same source as the quotation which has just been discussed. Resch has called attention to the similarity between the final words of the latter quotation *ὡς λαοῦ ἁγίου* (8.3) and the content of the present quotation, concluding that both derive from the apocryphal Ezekiel.¹

The two quotations may well derive from the same source, and that source may well be the apocryphal or expanded Ezekiel, but we can claim no more for these conjectures than possibility. Lacking any further knowledge and more suitable suggestions, however, we may tentatively conjecture that Clement has here made use of this apocryphal source.

At the same time, it is necessary to remember that Clement probably had access to a library containing a not inconsiderable number of non-canonical writings. Some of these are known to us indirectly (such as the apocryphal Ezekiel or *Eldad and Modad*); others, of which we have no knowledge, were doubtless available at the end of the first century. Consequently, we cannot be dogmatic about the suggestions which have been made above. But because this is true, we also cannot be dogmatic about the sources of certain of the more variant quotations, and especially the composite quotations which have been discussed in the preceding chapter. With regard to the former category, perhaps instead of free renderings of the canonical passages we have the accurate quotations of non-canonical sources which in turn are closely related to or dependent upon the canonical passages. Among the moderately variant quotations, Ezk. 33.11 (in 8.2) particularly comes to mind because of its close association with the quotation in 8.3, probably from the apocryphal Ezekiel as we have argued. Similarly, almost all of the quotations discussed as "non-septuagintal" in form

¹ *Agrapha*², p. 329. Resch also mentions the possibility of a NT motif underlying the passage (cf. Rom. 11.16).

present themselves as suitable candidates for explanation on the basis of apocryphal sources. While a few of those quotations may in fact derive from non-canonical sources, it seems hardly possible that all of them are so to be explained. But if in some cases Clement has rendered a canonical passage freely, whether by memory or design, it is possible that all of the instances in question are derived from canonical sources. It is our contention that for these quotations the more probable explanation, without excluding the other possibility, is that they are derived from the canonical parallels which have been mentioned.

The same possibility of non-canonical sources exists with regard to composite quotations. It may be that some of these are in reality derived from one such source rather than from two or more canonical passages; the words may be those of an unknown writer who may have made use of OT phraseology, even as pseudo-Ezekiel appears to have done. A good example of this is found in the combination of Isa. 40.10 and Pr. 24.12 (in 34.3) which is also found (apparently independently) in Rev. 22.12 and thus looks as though it may go back to a common source. It is clear that in composite quotations this kind of phenomenon may occasionally occur. Yet for most of the composite quotations, we regard this as an unlikely conjecture. Much more probable, as an alternative source, however, is the suggestion of a source containing a collection of passages—an anthology of quotations. This hypothesis although really a subdivision of the present section, is important enough to be considered separately in the section which follows.

C. ANTHOLOGIES

By "anthologies", we refer to collections of particular OT passages brought together in various manuals which are alternatively called *testimonia* or *florilegia*. While it is not necessary to review the history of the study of these collections,¹ we may briefly mention among the most important contributions, the two-volume work *Testimonies* by Rendel Harris.² In these volumes, Harris gathered together

¹ A very helpful survey may be found in P. Prigent, *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme Primitif: L'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses Sources* (Paris, 1961), "Les Testimonia. État de la question", pp. 16-28. J. A. Fitzmyer, "'4Q' Testimonia and the New Testament", *Theol. Stud.* 18 (1957), 513-537. See also Ellis, *Paul's Use of the OT*, pp. 98-107.

² Cambridge: vol. I, 1916; vol. II, 1920.

materials from the Fathers and the NT to present a strong argument for the existence of a single authoritative Testimony Book which antedated the NT writings, which was of anti-Jewish bias, and which he equated with the *λόγια* of Papias. This Book was said to contain collections of OT passages which were intended to be used in the Christian polemic against the Jews. Since the time of Harris, this hypothesis has been vigorously tested, and a number of important modifications urged. Few were persuaded by the contention that such a collection was what Papias referred to as *λόγια*;¹ it was further suggested that a number of anthologies rather than a single Testimony Book may have existed,² and that these may have been intended for liturgical and catechetical as well as polemical purposes. T. W. Manson suggested that the collected OT passages may not have existed in written form at all, the pertinent passages being instead contained in the memory of the early preachers of the Church.³ Most significant of all, however, was the work of C. H. Dodd who moved away from the Testimony Book hypothesis to an explanation of the same phenomena on the basis of the common use of certain extended portions of the OT Scriptures.⁴ Isolated, brief quotations were presented as a part of, and were meant to point to, the larger contexts viewed as wholes.

As a result of the criticisms which have been levelled at Harris, the Testimony Book hypothesis, as an explanation of the character of

¹ Harris was here following the suggestion of F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission* (Edinburgh, 1907), pp. 124-128. B. P. W. Stather Hunt also took up the argument in *Primitive Gospel Sources* (London, 1951), pp. 182-193; 319ff. For a defence of the view that *λόγια* refers to sayings of Jesus see T. W. Manson, "The Life of Jesus: A Survey of the Available Material: (4) The Gospel According to St. Matthew", *BJRL* 29 (1945-46), 392-428; and B. W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (New York, 1930), pp. 443-451.

² Cf. A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos* (Cambridge, 1935), p. 7. Hunt, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

³ "The Argument from Prophecy", *JTS* 46 (1945), 129-136.

⁴ *According to the Scriptures* (London, 1952). It may be added, in passing, that of the passages referred to by Dodd, serving as the sources of *testimonia* (p. 107f.), Clement employs material from the following: among the primary, Dn. 7; Is. 6.1-9.7; 40.1-11; 52.13-53.12; Ps. 22; 31; 88; 110; 2 (these last two Psalms are used indirectly via Hebrews); Gn. 12.3; among the subordinate, Mal. 3.1-6. This would appear to be a considerable number when the paraenetic (rather than kerygmatic) purpose of Clement's epistle is taken into account. Dodd's hypothesis has been criticized by A. C. Sundberg, Jr., but while some of the criticisms may be valid, it has not been overthrown. "On Testimonies", *Nov. Test.* 3 (1959), 268-281.

OT quotations in the NT, today stands largely in disrepute.¹ A further factor which has led to a general disenchantment with the question of *testimonia* is the lack of agreement concerning the character, purpose, and extent of such collections in the early Church.²

But while the existence of *testimonia* underlying the quotations in the NT remains a moot point, the influence of *testimonia* in the early Fathers has received new impetus, particularly through the work of Prigent.³ In the Epistle of Barnabas, Prigent finds evidence of several kinds of *testimonia* sources (e.g. "de polémique anticultuelle"; "messianiques"). In his more recent study of OT quotations in Justin Martyr, Prigent alleges that Justin in the *Apology* and *Dialogue* relies upon a treatise against all heresies ("Syntagma") which he claims to possess (*First Apology* 26). This work Prigent equates with the treatise against Marcion used by Irenaeus and Tertullian.⁴

Since the early investigations of Hatch,⁵ little has been written on the subject of testimonies in Clement's epistle. Recently, however, R. M. Grant has argued that a number of the OT quotations in Clement give evidence of having been derived from anthologies.⁶ These

¹ Cf. for example, the remarks of Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, pp. 207-217. In the preface to the second edition of his book (1967), Stendahl confirms his rejection of the testimony hypothesis despite the discovery of new evidence at Qumran (p. iiii.). Cf. Gundry, *The Use of the OT in St. Matthew's Gospel*, pp. 163-166. A more recent defender of Harris, however, is found in Hunt, *op. cit.*

² Cf. Prigent, *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme Primitif*, p. 27f. A number of divergent viewpoints seems inevitable when the subject of discussion centres on documents or traditions no longer extant.

³ On Barnabas, see *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme Primitif* (Paris, 1961). Against Prigent, however, see the long article by J.-P. Audet, "L'Hypothèse des Testimonia", *RB* 70 (1963), 381-405; on Justin Martyr, see Prigent, *Justin et L'Ancien Testament* (Paris, 1964); see also R. Kraft, "Barnabas' Isaiah Text and the 'Testimony Book' Hypothesis", *JBL* 79 (1960), 336-350. Kraft concludes that Barnabas' sources "lie somewhere between Jewish testimony literature (as seen at Qumran) and full-fledged Christian testimony books (Cyprian, et. al.)". p. 350. Against the suggestion that Barnabas uses a fixed Testimony Book, see L. W. Barnard, "The Testimonium Concerning the Stone in the New Testament and in the Epistle of Barnabas", *Studia Evangelica* III, TU 88 (Berlin, 1964), 306-313; additionally, see Barnard's chapter, "The Use of Testimonies in the Early Church and in the Epistle of Barnabas", *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 109-135.

⁴ *Justin et L'Ancien Testament*, p. 12. L. W. Barnard rightly criticizes Prigent's hypothesis, which he describes as "a return, in another form, to Rendel Harris' theory of a single testimony source". "Justin Martyr in Recent Study", *SJT* 22 (1969), 163.

⁵ *Essays in Biblical Greek*, pp. 204-207.

⁶ *AF* II, 10-13. Grant unfortunately does not give a full discussion of this hypothesis.

claims must be examined and the possibility that an anthology (or, anthologies) may underlie some of Clement's quotations must be considered.

Before we turn to this, however, we must call attention to extant collections of *testimonia* and look closely at the criteria which can be used to detect their presence in the quotations of the Fathers. The earliest explicit mention of a *testimonia* document is ascribed to Melito of Sardis (late second century) by Eusebius, who records Melito's reference to the six books containing ἐκλογὰς ἐκ τε τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν which he composed for a certain Onesimus. The earliest extant Christian *testimonia* document is from Cyprian (third century) and consists of a collection of OT passages directed against the Jews as well as passages concerning the Christ.¹ Further evidence exists in a collection attributed to Gregory of Nyssa (fourth century), and Eusebius' *Demonstratio* and *Prophetical Extracts*.² The most important direct evidence, however, is found in the Qumran documents known as 4Q Testimonia and 4Q Florilegium,³ the discovery of which revived the lagging interest in *testimonia*. Here, in these collections of eschatological texts which held special importance for the Qumran community, was the first tangible evidence that testimony books were in use in the first century. These Jewish documents, not dissimilar to the type of collections which Hatch had early conjectured,⁴ indicate that there were Jewish precursors which well may have served as models of early Christian anthologies.⁵

¹ Cyprian's book was one of the main pieces of evidence in Harris' argument. See *Testimonies* I, 5.

² For a convenient survey of the evidence, see Hunt, *op. cit.*, p. 194ff. Cf. Harris, *Testimonies* I.

³ For 4Q Testimonia see J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", *JBL* 75 (1956), especially pp. 182-187; J. A. Fitzmyer, *op. cit.*; see also F. F. Bruce, "Qumran and Early Christianity", *NTS* 2 (1955-56), 179f. For 4Q Florilegium, see especially J. M. Allegro, "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrāšim", *JBL* 77 (1958), 350-354. 4Q Florilegium is now fully available, together with 4Q Testimonia and other finds from Cave 4 at Qumran, in the official publication, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan* vol. V, Qumran Cave 4. I (4Q158-4Q186), ed. J. M. Allegro, with the collaboration of A. A. Anderson (Oxford, 1968), especially 53-60.

⁴ *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 203f. Hatch's view is thus vindicated against O. Michel's criticism "Es finden sich keine Spuren vorchristlichen Florilegien", *Paulus und seine Bibel*, p. 52.

⁵ "There can be little doubt that we have in this document a group of *testimonia* of the type long ago proposed by Burkitt, Rendel Harris, and others to have existed

In addition to these extant writings, proponents of the *testimonia* hypothesis argue that traces of the same collection(s) are found in Barnabas, Justin, Irenaeus and other writers of the early Church. From the later extant collections of *testimonia* (which allegedly incorporate the earlier collections) an idea of the early Christian Testimony Book may perhaps be gained. But by what criteria is the indirect evidence of *testimonia* in the early Fathers to be discovered?

While the criteria employed may vary slightly from author to author, they usually include the following factors:¹ (1) the quotation of the same OT passages independently by different authors, agreeing in variants against the LXX; (2) the presence of the same or similar composite quotations in different authors; (3) the quotation of the same series of passages in the same or similar sequence by different authors; and (4) the ascription of a quotation to the wrong source. Where these phenomena occur in authors that are independent it seems safe to say that a common source other than the LXX underlies the quotations, and quite probably that the source is a *testimonia* document (except for the first criterion, where the use of an alternative translation or recension is perhaps equally probable). However, these phenomena, as outlined here, are only rarely encountered. Even when they are encountered it is often difficult to rule out the possibility of direct dependence.² As a result, the above criteria are frequently modified so that if the phenomena (of criteria 1-3) are found only in *one* author they may be taken as an indication of reliance upon *testimonia*. Similarly other criteria are added which are also easier to satisfy but at the same time somewhat less reliable.³ Thus, for example, the presence of a number of citations grouped around a key word (*Stichwort*) or idea may be

in the early Church". Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", p. 186. Audet, however, regards the Qumran discoveries as private notes rather than documents intended for publication. "En soi, l'exhumation de notes de lecture, de fiches d'auteurs, d'aide-mémoire, ou de collections personnelles d'extraits bibliques à Qumrân ne devraient pas causer plus de surprise que la découverte d'abécédaires à Murabb'ât". "L'Hypothèse des Testimonia", p. 392.

¹ See Harris, *Testimonies* I, 8. Prigent, *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme Primitif*, p. 28. Cf. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 24.

² This is especially true of the Fathers, who often copied one another quite freely.

³ E.g., Harris refers to editorial material and material suitable for controversy. *Testimonies* I, 8. Prigent refers to the use of a series of quotations for a purpose other than that which inspired the collection to be made in the first place. *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme Primitif*, p. 28.

evidence of the use of a *testimonia* source, but it is also possible that the collections of texts is the work of the author himself.

When these criteria are applied to Clement's quotations can we arrive at any evidence for the reliance upon a collection of *testimonia*? In his chapter "On Composite Quotations from the Septuagint", Hatch examines five passages in Clement's epistle which he regards as probably derived from manuals of *excerpta*.¹ The first passage concerns the three Psalm quotations which are consecutively cited in chapter 15.4ff. Hatch argues that since the same cento is found in Clement of Alexandria, we have evidence of the use of the same manual. It is almost certain, however, that here as elsewhere the Alexandrian is dependent upon the Roman Clement.² The Psalm quotations are in almost exact agreement with the LXX text, and in all likelihood our Clement has composed the cento himself. The second passage to which Hatch refers is the long Psalm quotation in chapter 22, at the end of which (22.8) is added without indication a verse from a different Psalm. Here, it is argued, the added verse "preserves the sequence and antithesis of the passage so well that the whole quotation may be taken to be a separate current poem."³ While this is a possibility, it can in itself hardly be taken as evidence for such a source. Since Clement doubtless possessed a very thorough knowledge of the Greek scriptures, we may well assume that the conjunction was his own. For the next two passages, Hatch only gives the parallels and makes no comment. Both passages (34.6; 50.4) are composite quotations, the components of which find parallels in the canonical Scriptures. It is possible that these quotations derive from a manual of *excerpta*, but no evidence can be brought forward to substantiate such a claim. The final passage discussed by Hatch consists of a series of three OT quotations (Cl. 56.3-5) which are regarded as derived from a collection of quotations grouped about a particular subject.⁴ There is no reason, however, why Clement himself

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 204ff.

² See in the present work, p. 140. Hatch mentions that Clement of Alexandria does not separate the various quotations with the repeated *πάλιν λέγει* as does the Roman Clement. It is just as probable, however, that the Alexandrian, borrowing from the Roman Clement, has omitted the formulae, as it is that the Roman Clement, borrowing from a *testimonia* source, has inserted them.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 205. Hatch does not mention that the same combined quotations are found in Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 109, 1ff.). Again, however, we have direct dependence on the Roman Clement.

⁴ Hatch writes: "the want of cohesion between the third quotation and the two first

may not be responsible for the passage, having gathered quotations containing the verb *παιδεύω*. The evidence brought forward by Hatch seems too conjectural to be convincing.

The argument for Clement's use of an anthology presented by Grant, though equally brief, is more extensive in that it includes a greater number of passages than Hatch considered.¹ Beginning with the criteria suggested by Prigent,² but focusing on the grouping of quotations about a word or idea, Grant traces the use of a *florilegium* in Clement which he ventures to identify as having originated in Hellenistic Jewish circles. Rather than giving a full argument for his hypothesis, Grant simply gives the references with a comment upon each. The merits of each of these must be considered individually.

(a) Cl. 8.2-4. In 8.1 Clement writes οἱ λειτουργοὶ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου περὶ μετανοίας ἐλάλησαν. There follow three quotations having to do with "repentance", the first probably from Ezekiel, the second probably from an unknown source (Pseudo-Ezekiel, as we have argued) and the third from Isaiah. It must be admitted that this is exactly the kind of phenomenon that one would expect to encounter in *Stichwort* collections.³ There is nothing, however, that excludes the possibility that Clement himself collected these passages. It is in fact one of Clement's favourite devices to make use of a key word of a quotation or group of quotations in carrying forward his own argument.⁴ In addition to Clement's own penchant for taking up key words, there is an important variant in the first quotation which is not supported by the LXX, namely the substitution of the word *μετάνοιαν* for the words τὸ ἀποστρέψαι τὸν ἀσεβῆ ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ καὶ ζῆν αὐτόν. It seems more likely that Clement made the substitution rather than that the alteration was purposefully made to enable the passage to be included in a *Stichwort* collection.

(b) Cl. 13.1. In this passage a quotation apparently from Je. 9.23f. (cf. 1 Regn. 2.10) appears in somewhat different form from that of the

makes it probable that this is rather a series of quotations on a cognate subject than a single quotation from a composite poem". *Op. cit.*, p. 207.

¹ *AF* II, 10ff. See also the relevant passages in the commentary.

² *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme Primitif*, p. 28. Grant adds that "very vague source references point in the same direction". *AF* II, 10. Vague source references, however, may also point to memory quotation.

³ The earliest elaboration of the *Stichwort* theory is found in H. Vollmer, *Die alt-testamentlichen Citate bei Paulus* (Leipzig, 1895).

⁴ Lightfoot has compiled an interesting list of these instances. See I, 2, 142.

LXX. Although the form bears a clear resemblance to the portion of the same passage quoted in 1 Cor. 1.31, Grant disallows the influence of the latter as an explanation.¹ There is no reason, however, why the passage may not have been drawn from Jeremiah, and yet at the same time have been influenced by Clement's recollection of its form in 1 Corinthians, especially since it is certain that he was well acquainted with this epistle.² Even if the influence of 1 Corinthians be denied, there are a number of other alternatives to account for the form of the quotation in addition to the use of an anthology. Mentioned with the same passage is the quotation in 13.4 which, it is said, may belong with the quotations of 14.4 and 5 since all are concerned with the subject of meekness or gentleness. While these quotations may derive from an anthology, it is also possible that Clement has collected them himself.

(c) Cl. 15.2-6. All of these quotations deal with the subject of "false piety" and thus may derive from an anthology.³ Grant conjectures that the omission of a number of words by homoeoteleuton in Cl. 15.5 had occurred already in the *florilegium* upon which Clement was dependent. This is an interesting possibility, but cannot be confirmed.

(d) Cl. 22. The quotations in this chapter were also used by Hatch. Grant, like Hatch, refers to the fact that the final quotation is attached without formula to its antecedent. This and the similarity of content possibly indicate reliance upon an anthology.

(e) Cl. 23. The quotations of this chapter are conceivably derived from a more conventional *testimonia* document in that they may be described as "messianic".

(f) Cl. 26. This chapter contains two short quotations, the first being a composite quotation from the Psalms and the second a variant quotation from Job. They may derive from a collection of passages on the subject of the resurrection. Grant points out that the first quotation is introduced with a formula containing *ποῦ*. This, however, may also suggest the possibility of quotation from memory.

(g) Cl. 28.3. This quotation, introduced *λέγει γάρ που τὸ γραφεῖον*,

¹ Grant writes "The words parallel to 1 Cor. 1.31 in 1 Clem. 13.1 certainly do not come directly from 1 Corinthians". *AF* II, 13. No reason, however, is given to justify this alleged certainty.

² See below, pp. 195-209.

³ No attempt is made to substantiate this by appealing to the parallels in Clement of Alexandria, as Hatch had done with this passage.

differs considerably from the LXX. No further reason is given by Grant as to why the quotation is regarded as deriving from a *florilegium*.

(h) Cl. 29. Two quotations are found here, both concerned with the subject of election. The second is probably derived from a non-canonical source which may as easily be an apocryphal writing as an anthology.

(i) Cl. 34.3. This is a composite quotation which Grant associates with (e) above, since it also is concerned with the coming of $\delta \kappa \upsilon \rho \iota \omicron \varsigma$.¹

(j) Cl. 34.6 and 8. Grant relates these quotations to the one just discussed (i), as being derived from "a florilegium section related to eschatology".² On the other hand, however, it seems equally possible that the former is given from memory and the latter derived from 1 Cor. 2.9.

(k) Cl. 50.4 and 6. The first of these two quotations is a composite one which Grant related to (f) above, on the basis that both concern the resurrection. The second quotation, a nearly verbatim quotation from the Psalms on the subject of forgiveness is related to (d) by Grant.

(l) Cl. 52. The Psalm citations in this chapter are all concerned with sacrifice and may therefore possibly derive from an anthology.

(m) Cl. 56. This chapter contains a number of quotations which include the verb $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon \upsilon \omega$. Grant goes beyond Hatch in adding the final quotation from Job although he notes "it is possible that Clement, who clearly knows the book of Job, has added the last passage".³

As with the arguments of Hatch, the arguments of Grant lack substantiation. The evidence produced is the following: (1) the grouping of certain citations around a keyword or subject; (2) the presence of composite quotations; and (3) a number of indefinite or vague source references. The whole argument thus rests only upon quotations found in Clement's epistle, and no attempt is made to confirm the hypothesis by an appeal to parallels which could independently derive from the same source. But each of these phenomena is readily explainable without recourse to one or more hypothetical *florilegium* documents. It is natural for an author to gather together a number of quotations which underline the argument he is making; it is common for someone who quotes from memory to conflate passages which are cognate, and to employ indefinite introductory formulae. Moreover, Grant's hypothesis is made improbable simply by the large number of quota-

¹ Elsewhere Grant suggests that Clement is here quoting the canonical passages "from memory". *AF* II, 61.

² *AF* II, 12.

³ *Ibid.* One wonders why this explanation is allowed here and not elsewhere.

tions he undertakes to explain in this way. If Grant is correct, Clement quotes from the alleged anthology nearly as often as he does directly from the LXX. This we are bound to regard as unlikely without more direct evidence.

Thus, although we cannot deny the possibility that Clement has made use of an anthology or collection of *testimonia*, the arguments which are given do not sustain a contention of probability. The following factors weigh against this hypothesis: (1) In almost any writing which contains a large number of quotations, it is possible to group the quotations together under certain key words or concepts. This is especially true when one is allowed to associate quotations from different parts of the same writing (as Grant does with a number of Clement's quotations). Consequently, the argument may be said to reflect too widespread and natural a phenomenon to constitute evidence for actual dependence upon anthologies. (2) The component parts of Clement's composite quotations do not uniformly agree with or differ from the text of the LXX. Thus within the same quotation, one section may agree closely with the LXX, while another may depart considerably from the LXX. Similarly, in different composite quotations the same OT writing may be quoted sometimes closely agreeing with, sometimes departing from the LXX. In a *florilegium* source, however, one would expect to find a more consistent relationship (whether diverging or agreeing) to the LXX text. This phenomenon, if it is not explained as the result of Clement's own doing, must be accounted for in Clement's source. However, rather than to believe that the compiler of an anthology relied on memory and that Clement followed this source without making corrections, it is far easier to allow that Clement is in these instances quoting from memory, but with varying degrees of accuracy. (3) Other explanations of the phenomena are available which are equally satisfying and yet do not involve so difficult a conjecture as that of a written anthology source. That there are a number of inherent difficulties in the suggestion of hypothetical written documents has been pointed out by Audet.¹ Moreover, it is a faulty methodology that passes over satisfactory explanations which are readily available in favour of more difficult and conjectural hypotheses.² Thus there is little reason to resort to a hypothetical written *florilegium* document when other alternatives present themselves. Most

¹ "L'Hypothèse des Testimonia", especially p. 399ff.

² Audet rightly questions Prigent's methodology in this connection. *Ibid.*, p. 386.

composite quotations are readily explainable on the basis of memory;¹ the compilation of a string of quotations around a given word or subject is probably due to Clement's own industry,² using perhaps as a model the homiletical tradition of the Hellenistic synagogue,³ or in some instances borrowing certain combined quotations or series of quotations directly from sources of oral tradition.⁴

D. MEMORY

One of the most likely explanations of the aberrant phenomena encountered in Clement's quotations is that they are the result of the use of memory. There is today, however, an absorbing interest in possible dependence upon various non-canonical sources as an explanation for the form of what are ostensibly OT quotations in the writings of the early Church; and concomitant with this new interest is a new disparagement of the appeal to memory citation.⁵ Yet while it is

¹ W. Wrede writes "Indessen weisen mehrere Zitate bestimmt auf eine gedächtnismässige Anführungsweise hin. Es sind diejenigen, in welchen Klemens mehrere Schriftstellen offenbar vermischt". *Untersuchungen zum ersten Klemensbriefe*, p. 64f. Cf. Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 66. Grant acknowledges that Wrede's explanation of the composite quotations on the basis of memory may be correct. *AF* II, 10.

² Wrede justly remarks concerning the quotations which are "mit offenbar Sorgfalt ausgewählt, mit Fleiss zusammengestellt, mit Absicht gehäuft". *Op. cit.*, p. 61. Harnack also refers to the "sorgfältige Zusammenstellungen gleichartiger Stellen". *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 66.

³ G. F. Moore has called attention to the fact that in the synagogue, "the homilists in all ages worked into their discourses a great deal of quotation, not only from the Law and the Prophets, but from the Hagiographa". *Judaism* I (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), 305. See also Thyen's discussion of "Das AT und die hellenistische Synagoge" in *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie* (Göttingen, 1955), pp. 110-116. Similarly, K. Stendahl writes that "The methods of the synagogue in dealing with the texts of the O.T., both in liturgical reading and in teaching, account for most of the features Harris wanted to explain by his Book of Testimonies". *The School of St. Matthew*, p. 217; cf. also Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 53; Michel, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

⁴ L. W. Barnard refers to the importance of "a common method and tradition" and suggests that a pattern of catechetical teaching "may well prove to be the key to the understanding of the use of the Old Testament in the early Church". *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background*, p. 110f. Barnard calls attention to "a strong oral tradition" as a major factor in accounting for the quotations in Barnabas. *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁵ This new attitude is typified in the remarks of Kraft: "The modern commentator on early Christian literature need not feel despair when he is confronted by an O.T.-like quotation which is not exactly paralleled in extant older literature. The once over-

important to give due consideration to the availability and possible use of these additional sources, it is wrong to underestimate the role which citation from memory may have played in the form of these early quotations. Because the appeal to memory citation has been made perhaps too facilely and too consistently in the past is little reason to go to the opposite extreme and to reject with equal facility and thoroughness every explanation on the basis of memory in favour of a number of various hypothetical written (or oral) sources.

Quite certainly memory played a much more important role in the ancient world, and as a consequence the faculty of memory was much more exercised and developed, than in modern times.¹ This was true not only in the handing down of religious tradition in various cultures from the earliest times,² but also in the educational process itself.³ B. Gerhardsson has pointed out, for example, the importance of recitation from memory in Hellenistic education at both the most elementary and advanced levels, and also in the philosophical law schools.⁴ In Graeco-Roman education the cultivation of memory (*memoria*) composed one of the five major parts of Rhetoric.⁵ Quintilian, in his famous treatise *Institutio Oratoria* (II, 7, 2-4), expounds the importance of committing "the best writings" to memory so that the most excellent and useful phraseologies might become the student's own.

If memory was thus an important tool in pagan education in the first century, how much more important it would have been in the Judaeo-Christian tradition. Gerhardsson has again traced the im-

worked appeal to 'citation from memory' is only one among many possible explanations, which include the use of *Testimonia*, targumic or midrashic rewriting of scripture, psalmic compositions, scriptural commentary tradition, and the like". Review of P. Prigent's *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme Primitif*, *JTS* 13 (1962), 405.

¹ "In the tradition of western culture it is only in our own day that the memory has been *effectively* unloaded into books. Not until our own day have we learned to accept a form of education which to a great extent consists of being able to find the material which is required in the right books, without needing to carry it all in the memory. Not until our day has the pedagogical revolution taken place which has been called 'the dethronement of memory'". B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript* (Uppsala, 1961), p. 123. Cf. A. W. Ziegler, *Neue Studien zum ersten Klemensbrief* (Munich, 1958), p. 48.

² See for example H. M. and N. K. Chadwick, *The Growth of Literature*, 3 volumes (Cambridge, 1932-40).

³ "Beaucoup plus que nous, à l'école comme dans la lecture privée,—habituellement faite à haute voix—les hommes de ce temps apprenaient par cœur". Audet, "L'Hypothèse des Testimonia", p. 404, n. 22.

⁴ *Memory and Manuscript*, p. 124ff.

⁵ See D. L. Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (New York, 1957), p. 170f.

portance of memory in the learning of the written Torah within the elementary education of Rabbinic Judaism.¹ In a similar way, there can be no question about the preeminent position the Scriptures held for the Christians of the first century and of their suitability for memorization.² The OT writings spoke of Christ and the Church, proclaimed the Gospel, and gave guidance for conduct. Inevitably these writings were studied and large portions of them were committed to memory.³ Thus Clement in three places refers to the Corinthians as men who had studied and who were well-versed in the Scriptures (45.2; 53.1; 62.3). Clement, himself a man of considerable education, as an important personage of the Roman Church, doubtless possessed a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures and would have been able to quote a great amount of their contents from memory.

In addition to the importance which the memorization of Scripture held for the Christians of the first century, another significant factor must be taken into consideration in our argument. Since MSS of the OT were probably papyrus rolls⁴ containing texts running continuously without divisions,⁵ reference to specific passages was a troublesome task. Thus an author, writing a treatise or a letter, might recall some passage of Scripture pertinent to his own argument and, failing to

¹ *Memory and Manuscript*, pp. 56-66. Cf. G. F. Moore, who writes "The method of the schools developed not only exact and retentive memory and great mental acuteness, but an exhaustive and ever-ready knowledge of every phrase and word of Scripture". *Judaism I*, 320; cf. 2 Tim. 3.15.

² Harnack has pointed out the importance of memorization in the later Church, adding that in antiquity "reading and learning by heart were more closely connected than with us". *Bible Reading in the Early Church*, trans. J. R. Wilkinson (London, 1912), p. 125. For the importance of reading in the period of Clement see *ibid.*, pp. 32-47. Gerhardsson indicates the importance of reading the Scriptures in the synagogue service, which although required to be "from the book", was often given from memory. *Memory and Manuscript*, pp. 67-70. Cf. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford, 1925), p. 115f.

³ When it is remembered that in the ancient world, reading was always aloud, it will be seen that the very act of reading itself became a vehicle of memorization. "Reading in the ancient world, even solitary reading, invariably meant reading aloud". C. H. Roberts, "Books in the Graeco-Roman World and in the New Testament", *CHB I*, eds. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge, 1970), p. 49.

⁴ This probability, however, is becoming increasingly subject to question, as the date for the beginning of the use of the codex in the Church is pushed earlier and earlier. See below p. 290, n. 3; and p. 313, n. 2.

⁵ See V. H. Stanton's excursus on "The Form of Ancient Books as Affecting Habits of Quotation", *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (Cambridge, 1903), I, 22-25.

remember its location, or preferring not to take time to find the passage, be content to quote it from memory.¹ In some instances the memory may have reproduced a passage exactly; in other instances it may have produced an approximation of the original.

The importance of memory in the first century, and the difficulty of reference in the papyrus MSS of the OT writings, together constitute an *a priori* probability that at least some of Clement's quotations derive from memory. A look at the quotations themselves seems to confirm this probability.

In the preceding chapter, the quotations listed as "moderately variant" and "non-septuagintal" are relatively brief whereas all of the lengthy quotations are quoted in nearly exact agreement with the LXX. It is understandable that while Clement would probably want to refer to the MSS for the longer passages, for the shorter ones he might not take the trouble to do so. While reliance upon memory does not necessarily account for all of these aberrant quotations, there is every reason to believe that in many instances it may do so. A number of the shorter "essentially verbatim" quotations may also derive from memory, but in these instances they have been retained more effectively.

In all likelihood, Clement's use of the adverb *ποῦ*, "somewhere", in certain of his introductory formulae points to quotation from memory. Of its five occurrences in this usage, *ποῦ* is used to introduce three quotations which we have designated "non-septuagintal" in form (21.2 [Pr. 20.27]; 28.3 [Ps. 138.7-10]; and 42.5 [Is. 60.17]); one "moderately variant" quotation (15.2 [Is. 29.13, but influenced by Mk. 7.6 and parallels]); and one "composite" quotation (26.2 [various Psalm passages]). Clement apparently did not remember where these passages were, and believed that he could quote them accurately enough without bothering to trace their location.

Clement's use of *ποῦ* with a composite quotation suggests that the majority of these may well be due to a confusion caused by memory citation. On the other hand, some of the combinations may already have been available to Clement via tradition, perhaps of a homiletical or catechetical character. However, the extent to which this may be true remains disputable. The same may be said for quotations tacked direct-

¹ It should be remembered that apparently no premium was put upon verbal exactness in citations; what was important was the sense of the passage. See Stendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 157f. Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 4f.

ly onto preceding quotations as well as series of independent quotations linked by introductory formulae. Here the most natural explanation is memory: the process of citing one passage brings to remembrance other passages of Scripture containing the same or similar thought. This stringing together of various Scripture passages constituted a homiletical convention of the Hellenistic synagogue¹ and it is possible that Clement borrowed this device from the synagogue homily. It is also possible, although much more doubtful, that Clement borrowed actual combinations and series of quotations from the homiletic tradition. More probably, Clement uses the model, but assembles his own series of passages in accord with his own purposes.²

Since the circumstances under which Clement wrote his epistle were those in which quotation from memory flourished, and since many of the quotation phenomena of the epistle are explained most easily and most adequately by quotation from memory, we find every reason for, and no reason against,³ concluding that Clement has in a number of instances relied, with varying degrees of success, upon his memory for the quotations.⁴

¹ See Thyen, *op. cit.*, p. 75ff; p. 65; cf. Stendhal, *op. cit.*, p. 216f.

² Cf. Wrede, *op. cit.*, p. 61ff. Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 66.

³ We here call attention to the work of C. Eggenberger who forcefully denies the possibility of quotation from memory. Referring primarily to Harnack's appeals to memory in accounting for the form of certain quotations, Eggenberger writes "Wir halten diese 'e memoria'—Theorie für absolut falsch und für geeignet, das wahre Verständnis unseres Schreiben zu verhindern. Dem gegenüber stellen wir die These auf: Unser Verfasser zitiert genau, wenn seiner Absicht mit dem genauen Wortlaut gedient ist, er zitiert willkürlich, wenn seiner Absicht mit dieser Willkür gedient werden kann". *Die Quellen der politischen Ethik des 1. Klemensbriefes* (Zürich, 1951), p. 55f. Eggenberger's attempt to account for the variants in the quotations as the result of Clement's own arbitrary adjustment of the LXX in favour of his own purpose (the inculcation of a submissive attitude to the Roman Empire) is virtually a complete failure. In the first place, nowhere is it explained why Clement may not have quoted from memory. Secondly, and most importantly, only a selected number of variants are discussed by Eggenberger. Further, if there are variants which do agree with Clement's purpose this may well be accounted for on the basis of quotation from memory. It is psychologically understandable that an imprecision of memory in a quotation will tend to favour one's own argument. Whether, however, the submission Clement has in mind is in the first place submission to Rome is very doubtful.

⁴ Knoch in his examination of the quotations justly writes "Bei der Zitationsmethode ist für Cl. charakteristisch, dass er weithin aus dem Gedächtnis zitiert,—ein Zeichen dafür, dass Cl. in der Schrift des AT zu Hause ist". *Op. cit.*, p. 52. Cf. Wrede, who also speaks of "einen nicht geringen Gedächtnisbesitz des Klemens". *Op. cit.*, pp. 63. W. G. Kümmel also refers to the frequent use of memory by early Christian writers. "Schriftauslegung im Urchristentum", *RGG*³, V, 1518.

Our analysis of Clement's OT quotations reveals a complex situation which in not a few places presents a number of vying alternatives and little possibility of certainty in source determination. A large majority of the quotations are derived from the LXX whether directly by copying or indirectly from memory. Others, although quoted as "Scripture" come from non-canonical writings. For certain variant quotations other possibilities appear, such as non-septuagintal translations and anthologies. However, while these possibilities must be kept in mind, the quotations in question are readily explainable on the basis of memory citation, and since the use of the latter is in itself a probability, lacking further evidence of direct dependence upon literary or oral sources, we conclude that Clement is in these instances very probably quoting the canonical writings from memory.¹

¹ Sanday comes to a similar conclusion: "Some of the cases of combination and some of the divergences of text may be accounted for by the assumption of lost apocryphal books or texts; but it would be wholly impossible, and in fact no one would think of so attempting to account for all. There can be little doubt that Clement quotes from memory, and none that he quotes at times very freely". *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 30f. Sanday's balanced viewpoint is preferable to the extravagant claims which are occasionally made in favour of this or that hypothesis.

CHAPTER FOUR

CLEMENT'S VIEW OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Before concluding our discussion of the use of the Old Testament in Clement's epistle, we turn from the actual method of quotation to look at Clement's own view of the OT writings. What does Clement say concerning the nature of these writings so far as their inspiration is concerned? Secondly, what is the extent of Clement's OT canon, and what are the implications of Clement's use of non-canonical writings for the history of the OT canon in the early Christian Church? And finally, what may be said concerning Clement's understanding and interpretation of the OT? The extensive use of the OT in Clement's epistle provides excellent source material for establishing not only Clement's view of the OT, but by implication the view held by the Church as a whole at the end of the first century.

A. INSPIRATION

The earliest Christians not only accepted the Jewish Scriptures as their own, but also the Jewish view concerning the inspiration of those Scriptures.¹ For the Jews, inspiration began with the Torah, which was regarded as pre-existent, and thus held to be a direct creation of God. While there were various theories as to how Moses was given the Torah, its divine origin was never questioned. The second and third parts of the Hebrew canon were also early regarded as having been inspired directly by God.² The Jewish view of inspiration is illustrated in the titles used by Philo and Josephus in referring to the Scriptures, e.g. *ἱερὰ βιβλία*, *ἱερὰ γραφαί*, *ἱερὰ γράμματα*, as well as the introductory formulae used with quotations, many of which also point to the divine origin of the Scriptures.³

¹ Cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (3rd ed.; London, 1965), p. 60ff.

² A full discussion of the Rabbinic views of inspiration is found in Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* IV/1 (München, 1928), 435-451.

³ See the discussion in W. Sanday, *Inspiration* (London, 1894), pp. 70-90. Sanday concludes that "There can be no doubt that it was a rooted idea among the Jews of the

The same view of the OT Scriptures is found in the NT.¹ That the writers of the NT regard the OT as absolutely authoritative is immediately apparent from the way in which they quote from it for purposes of demonstration and proof and also from the introductory formulae used with the quotations.² In addition, there are two passages which speak directly concerning the inspiration of the OT: in 2 Tim. 3.16, *πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος*; and in 2 Pet. 1.21, *οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι*.

The viewpoint expressed here is identical with that of early Judaism on the one hand³, and with that of the later Church on the other.⁴ Although in the Apostolic Fathers there are no such explicit statements concerning the inspiration of the OT writings, it is readily apparent that their view has not altered from that of the NT writers. This again can be seen in the formulae used to introduce OT quotations.⁵

In Clement's epistle the introductory formulae employed reveal in themselves a high view of the Scriptures. Thus as the speaker in the OT, explicit reference is made to *ὁ θεός* (10.4; 18.1; 33.5; 53.2); *ὁ δεσπότης* (8.2; 36.4); and *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον* (13.1; 16.2).⁶ Quotations are also introduced as from *ὁ ἅγιος λόγος* (13.4; 56.3) and *ἡ πανάρετος σοφία* (57.3). There are, however, in addition to these formulaic references, further indications of the divine origin of the OT Scriptures in Clement's epistle.

Thus Clement, like Philo and Josephus, can speak of *ἱερὰ βιβλοὶ* (43.1) in referring to the books which Moses wrote. Similarly, Clement writes to the Corinthians, *ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰς ἱερὰς γραφάς, τὰς ἀληθεῖς, τὰς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου* (45.2).⁷ These words

first century, both Hellenistic and Palestinian, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament came from God". (p. 73).

¹ See Schrenk's discussion, *TDNT* I, 757.

² This evidence is fully and conveniently available in D. M. Turpie, *The New Testament View of the Old* (London, 1872).

³ Strack-Billerbeck write concerning 2 Pet. 1.21 "Wir haben hier ein Beispiel, wie die erste Christenheit kein Bedenken getragen hat, an einem jüdischen Lehrstück mit allen seinen Einzelheiten festzuhalten, sobald es ihrer eigenen Anschauung entsprach". *Op. cit.*, IV/1, 451.

⁴ Cf. Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

⁵ These have been examined above, pp. 31-33.

⁶ These references include quotations from all three parts of the Hebrew canon. See above, p. 26ff.

⁷ Cf. Polycarp's reference to *sacris literis* (*Phil.* 12.1); cf. *ἱερὰ γράμματα* in 2 Tim. 3.15.

clearly reflect the exalted view of the OT held by Clement. Directly comparable to the latter passage are the words of 53.1 : ἐπίστασθε γὰρ καὶ καλῶς ἐπίστασθε τὰς ἱερὰς γραφάς, ἀγαπητοί, καὶ ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ. Clement also refers to the Scriptures as τὰ λόγια in 19.1, and in 62.3 speaks of τὰ λόγια τῆς παιδείας τοῦ θεοῦ. The words of the OT Scriptures are for Clement the words or "oracles" of God in written form. They derive from God, reveal His will, and are thus of supreme authority.¹

If it is clear that Clement regarded the OT Scriptures as having come from God and so possessing the highest degree of inspiration, it is not very clear exactly which writings were regarded by Clement as included in this class. We are thus faced with the question of the state of the OT canon in the Christian Church at the end of the first century. What may be inferred from Clement's epistle about the extent of his OT canon ?

B. CANON

Clement, as we have seen, quotes from all three sections of the Hebrew Canon : the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings or Hagiographa.² The Law and the Prophets were, of course, already well established by Clement's day. The same may be said for most of the writings which composed the third section of the canon. Indeed, it is among the Hagiographa that three of Clement's favourite books are to be found : Psalms, Job and Proverbs. Clement also quotes from Daniel and alludes to Esther from among the writings of the third division, and although there are no indications, he quite probably knew all of the Hagiographa. But Clement, as we have seen, goes further than this, employing non-canonical writings—both from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha—in a way not dissimilar to his use of the canonical writings.³

Clement is not, moreover, the only writer in the early Church to make use of non-canonical writings. Apocryphal writings are quoted in the NT, as for example in Jude 14ff., where Enoch is quoted, and

¹ Cf. Harnack, who writes that for Clement "Das A.T. ist göttliches Wort, d.h. Diktat Gottes und als litera scripta die höchste und letzte Autorität". *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 67. See also the similar remarks of Wrede, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

² See above, pp. 26-28.

³ See above, pp. 86-93.

possibly in Jas. 4.5, where a quotation not found in the OT is introduced ἡ γραφή λέγει.¹ But despite the presence of such allusions and quotations in the NT, it is not at all evident that these writings were accorded the same status as the writings of the canon.² In the Apostolic Fathers, non-canonical quotations appear somewhat more frequently and with a number of interesting introductory formulae. Thus in Barnabas, quotations from Enoch occur in 4.3 and 16.5, the first being introduced γέγραπται ὡς Ἐνώχ λέγει, and the second, λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή.³ A non-canonical quotation is found in 2 Cl. 11.2, introduced with the words λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος (a large part of the same quotation is introduced as ἡ γραφή αὕτη in 1 Cl. 23.3f.). In Hermas' *Shepherd*, a quotation explicitly from the book *Eldad and Modad* is introduced with γέγραπται (*Vis.* II, 3, 4).

Clement's epistle itself contains allusions to Judith (Cl. 55.4f.) and quotations from Wisdom (Cl. 3.4 and 27.5), but without introductory formulae. Beyond this, however, Clement quotes from at least one, but more probably from several non-canonical writings (*Eldad and Modad*, Apocryphal Ezekiel, *Assumption of Moses*, as we have argued), using introductory formulae much as with canonical quotations, in one place employing γέγραπται (46.2), and once (23.3) referring to ἡ γραφή αὕτη (cf. 2 Cl. 11.2).

The question which is immediately raised by these various quotations concerns the actual status of these extra-canonical writings in the early Church. If the canon of the Law and the Prophets had already been agreed upon, the canon of the Hagiographa seems to have been in a state of flux late into the first century AD. Can we suppose that the Apostolic Fathers, and Clement in particular, regarded these writings as belonging to their canon and thus as inspired Scripture in the same sense as the Law and Prophets?

In order to be in a better position to answer this question, we must first briefly review what has been the common account of the history of the OT canon in Judaism and the early Church. Within Judaism,⁴

¹ Other possible non-canonical quotations are found in Lk. 11.49; Jn. 7.38; 1 Cor. 2.9; and Eph. 5.14. See Schrenk, *TDNT* I, 756.

² Schrenk notes that "the same solemnity does not attach to it [apocryphal citation] as to canonical citation". *Ibid.*

³ Barnabas also quotes probably from 4 Ezra (= 2 Esdras) in 12.1, and 2 Baruch in 11.9, referring to both as "prophets".

⁴ For a brief summary of the three stage development of the Hebrew canon, see O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, trans. P. R. Ackroyd, 1966), pp. 562-571.

while the extent of the Law and Prophets had been agreed upon well before Christian times, the extent of the Kethubim remained undecided until the official establishment of its contents by Palestinian Jews at the synod of Jamnia at about 90 AD.¹ From the time of Jamnia onwards the Hebrew canon was closed, and use of the Apocrypha or other non-canonical writings was expressly forbidden in Rabbinic circles.²

The Christian Church, however, is usually said to have received its OT canon not via Palestinian Judaism but via the Septuagint of Alexandrian Judaism. Since the LXX, as it has come down to us, contains a number of writings which are not found in the Hebrew canon, it is assumed that the Alexandrian Jews recognized a canon larger than that of the Palestinian Jews and that this larger canon was in turn inherited by the early Church. This hypothesis allegedly accounts for the extra-canonical quotations encountered in the early literature of the Church: they are the result of the initial acceptance of the Alexandrian rather than Palestinian canon.³

The Alexandrian canon hypothesis, however, has not been without its critics, the most recent of whom is A. C. Sundberg, Jr.⁴ Sundberg traces the history of this hypothesis and criticizes its foundations, arguing among other things that the early Church makes use of more writings than the Alexandrian canon supposedly contained, and that therefore the hypothesis is unsatisfactory.⁵ In place of the hypothesis

Fuller discussions are found in F. Buhl, *Canon and Text of the Old Testament*, trans. J. Macpherson (Edinburgh, 1892), pp. 4-43; H. E. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament*² (London, 1904), pp. 75-190; Strack-Billerbeck, "Der Kanon des Alten Testaments u. seine Inspiration", IV/1. 415-434. See, more recently, R. H. Pfeiffer, "Canon of the OT", *IDB* I, 498-520; G. W. Anderson, "Canonical and Non-Canonical", *CHB* I, 113-159.

¹ The legend contained in 2 (4) Esdras 14 that Ezra miraculously copied out and published the twenty-four books of the Hebrew canon cannot be taken as historical. The same must be said for the statements in Josephus (*Contra Apionem* I, 8) and the Talmud (*Baba Bathra* 14b, 15a) which imply that the whole of the canon was complete from the time of Artaxerxes I (465-424). See Eissfeldt, *op. cit.*, p. 562ff.

² Cf. Ryle, *op. cit.*, p. 199; C. T. Fritsch, "Apocrypha", *IDB* I, 163.

³ Cf. Buhl, *op. cit.*, p. 54ff; Ryle, *op. cit.*, pp. 191; 219f; Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

⁴ *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

⁵ Referring to the use of extra-canonical writings in the Apostolic Fathers, Sundberg writes that "the number of books used in the early church not only exceeded the number in the Hebrew canon but also that of the conjectured Alexandrian canon. Thus, early Christian usage does not provide the confirmation of the adoption of an Alexandrian canon that we should expect". *Ibid.*, p. 53.

of an Alexandrian canon, Sundberg sets forth his own hypothesis, viz., that the use of non-canonical writings in the Christian Church is to be explained by the fact that the earliest Christians were Jews who received the Palestinian canon, the third division of which was yet open. By the time the third division was decided upon by the discussions of Jamnia at the end of the first century, Christianity was well established as an independent entity and remained unaffected—at least for a considerable period of time—by the Jewish decisions, thus retaining as canonical an undefined collection of writings in addition to the Law and the Prophets.¹

While Sundberg has pointed out some weaknesses of the Alexandrian canon hypothesis, it is difficult to know how far his own hypothesis is true, since it rests not on any new evidence brought forward, but on a reinterpretation of evidence already familiar. Sundberg does seem to have shown, however, that there is little warrant for making an absolute contrast between the development of the Jewish canon in Alexandria and in Palestine.² On the one hand, there were many non-canonical writings in circulation in first century Palestine and, on the other hand, little evidence exists for a closed canon (of whatever extent) in Alexandria. At the same time, we may mention two points by way of criticism of Sundberg's hypothesis. First, Sundberg seems to presuppose too fluid a situation so far as the third division of the Hebrew canon in Palestine is concerned, contending that it was a large body of undifferentiated writings with which the Rabbis at Jamnia had to deal. It seems more probable, however, that most of the writings of the third division were agreed upon and already comprised a *de facto* canon, upon which the Rabbis for the most part simply put their stamp of approval.³ Secondly, Sundberg seems to underestimate

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

² See in this connection the informative article by P. Katz, "The OT Canon in Palestine and Alexandria", *ZNTW*, 47 (1956), 191-217.

³ Thus Ryle, speaking of Jamnia, writes "It marks, however, only the official conclusion. Practically, we may be sure, its bounds had long before been decided by popular use ... The Jewish Rabbis had only, as it were, to affix an official seal to that which had already long enjoyed currency among the people". *Op. cit.*, p. 183f. Sundberg wrongly lists Ryle as opposing this viewpoint. *The OT of the Early Church*, p. 84. See also Buhl, *op. cit.*, p. 27. A. Bentzen similarly writes "The canon in reality was finished before the time of the synod, but perhaps more in the character of a collection grown out of practical use". *Introduction to the Old Testament*, I (Copenhagen, 1952), p. 31; Cf. R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, 1941), p. 66; Eissfeldt, *op. cit.*, p. 568; G. F. Moore, *Judaism I* (Cambridge, Mass., 1946 reprint), 242. H. H. Rowley, *The*

the influence which the LXX, with its additions and extra-canonical books, must have exerted upon Diaspora Judaism, and in turn upon the early Church.¹ The LXX was not accepted in itself as an Alexandrian "canon", but, because it was more extensive than the Hebrew canon, perhaps indirectly opened the door to the idea of a wider canon, serving as the impetus for the inclusion or consideration of other writings.

It seems quite likely that the use of a more extensive canon in the early Church is not to be explained solely on the basis of the situation either in Alexandria or in pre-Jamnia Palestine. It may well be that both Alexandria and Palestine made their respective contributions to the uncertainty of the Church as to whether or not certain writings were to be included among the Hagiographa. Certainly, however, in view of the obscurity of the question and the little data having a direct bearing on it, there is little room for dogmatic pronouncements.

In whatever way it may eventually have happened, we do know that the exact definition of the OT canon remained undecided in the early Church for a considerable period of time.² But it is surprising to note that when Christian lists of OT books *were* forthcoming, they adhered very closely to the contents of the Hebrew canon,³ despite the fact that a larger number of writings were used and quoted.⁴ This may well have been, in large degree, a reaction to the refusal of Jews to listen to arguments from what were to them extra-canonical writings.⁵ This in itself, however, doubtless gave Christians reason to ponder the inspiration of these writings, the more so since even among themselves it was not always clear which writings were to be included in the OT.

It is worth pointing out that knowledge of, or even the use of, a writing does not necessarily guarantee its canonical status. At the end

Growth of the Old Testament (New York, 1963 reprint), p. 170; Cf. G. W. Anderson, *op. cit.*, p. 131f.

¹ Cf. Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 53. Ryle, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

² Cf. G. Hölscher, *Kanonisch und Apokryph* (Naumberg, 1905), p. 66.

³ This evidence is conveniently set forth by Sundberg, *The OT of the Early Church*, p. 133ff.

⁴ Zahn has called attention to this: "Man zählte die Bücher des hebräischen Kanons, aber man hatte und las als hl. Schriften des AT's ganze Bücher und umfangreiche Zuthaten zu Büchern, welche in der hebräischen Bibel gar nicht vorhanden waren". *GNTK* I, 118.

⁵ This is the argument of Sundberg, *The OT of the Early Church*, p. 135ff.

of the first century, Josephus, for example, is emphatically explicit concerning the canonicity of only twenty-two books (identical, or nearly so, with our 39),¹ although he uses the LXX and quotes from the Apocrypha. Somewhat earlier, Philo, although consistently using the LXX and acquainted with its additional books, simply refrains from quoting the Apocrypha. Although probably contained among the writings of the LXX,² these were not regarded as canonical Scripture.³ Again, the writers of the NT unquestionably knew and were influenced by apocryphal writings, and yet never quote them in the same way they do the OT.

Returning to our original question, what may we infer concerning Clement's OT canon and his estimation of writings outside the Hebrew canon? There can be little question but that Clement's OT canon was not a closed one. At the time Clement wrote, the Hebrew canon was in the process of being finally established in Palestine. In Rome, presumably both Jews and Christians possessed and used a number of writings, the canonicity of which was not yet a settled matter. The majority of books were agreed upon, but there remained the writings which we call the Apocrypha as well as a number of apocalyptic writings which were perhaps doubtful. Several alternatives present themselves so far as the valuation of these writings is concerned: these writings may have been accepted as Scripture on a par with the other books of the OT; they may have been regarded as inspired and authoritative, but to a lesser degree than, and thus inferior to, the other books of the OT; or they may simply have been regarded as interesting and helpful writings but not essentially different in character from other secular literature of the day.

Unfortunately, Clement is not explicit concerning his own view of the writings in question. There are possible indications that Clement may have been aware of the classification of OT writings according to the threefold Hebrew canon. In 28.3, introducing a variant quotation from Ps. 138, Clement writes λέγει γάρ που τὸ γραφεῖον. The expression

¹ *Contra Apionem* I, 8.

² Since our LXX MSS are all Christian (apart from some pre-Christian fragments), dating from the fourth century AD, it is not quite certain that the pre-Christian "LXX" contained the Apocrypha.

³ See Ryle, *op. cit.*, p. 156f. Similarly, a large number of apocryphal writings have been found at Qumran, but this need not indicate that they were regarded as canonical, or possessed the character of canonical writings.

τὸ γραφεῖον may well be an intentional reference to the third division of the canon, which on occasion was referred to collectively as τὰ γραφεῖα (cf. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 29, 7, 2ff.).¹ Another interesting term, ἡ πανάρετος σοφία (57.3) introduces a quotation from Proverbs, and is probably a special designation used in referring to this book,² rather than a term referring to the Hagiographa.³ Clement thus may well have known the concept of a third division of writings, as yet not fully determined, in addition to the Law and the Prophets (for which see 43.1).⁴

There is no way of telling whether Clement regarded the "non-canonical" writings he uses as belonging to this third division of the canon or not. The only source of information we have concerning Clement's view of these writings is, in fact, found in the introductory formulae he employs with them. With the two quotations from Wisdom (Cl. 3.4 and 27.5) no introductory formulae are used, but it is difficult to know whether this silence is deliberate or accidental. For two of the other quotations which we have classified as non-canonical (17.6 and 29.3, as well as 34.8, if it is not derived from 1 Cor. 2.9), the formulae include nothing more significant than the verb λέγει, which although elsewhere commonly introduces OT quotations is relatively neutral so

¹ "In der kirchlichen, wohl vorher auch jüdisch-hellenistischen Sprache, heisst γραφεῖα gelegentlich der dritte Teil des hebräischen Kanons, die Ketubim, die auch ἀγιογγραφα genannt werden. Für diese Bezeichnung liegt hier die älteste Bezeugung vor". Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 92. Thus also Lightfoot I, 2, 92; Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 112; K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* I, 57. Against this viewpoint, see Donaldson, *op. cit.*, p. 184. Lake adds "it was in a sense 'Scripture' but not considered as important as the 'Law' and the 'Prophets' ". This statement, however, is hardly borne out by Clement who throughout the epistle has the highest possible regard for the Psalms.

² Thus explicitly Eusebius, in referring to the practice of Hegesippus and Irenaeus (*HE* IV, 22, 9). Cf. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 135. Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 119. Grant, however, denies this identification, preferring to see the reference to "wisdom" as a personification of the speaker in the passage. *AF* II, 90.

³ Lake says that the title is used not only to refer to (a) Proverbs, but is used also "(b) of Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, and Ecclesiastes, (c) of the third division of the O.T. (Hagiographa or 'Writings') as a whole". *The Apostolic Fathers* I, 107. No evidence, however, can be found to support this contention.

⁴ Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley: "The knowledge of the division of the OT canon is taken for granted [by Clement]: thus in 28.3 'the writing' ... is spoken of, and a quotation from the Psalms follows; in 43.1 the term 'the holy books' is applied to the Pentateuch (the Law), while by 'the other prophets' (i.e. besides Moses) the prophetic books are obviously meant". *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford, 1925), p. 114f.

far as any implication of inspiration is concerned.¹ In two remaining non-canonical quotations, however, the introductory formulae are somewhat more promising. In 23.3 the formula is *πόρρω γενέσθω ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἡ γραφή αὕτη, ὅπου λέγει*. If this quotation is derived from *Eldad and Modad*, as we have argued, then we have an apparent reference to that writing as "Scripture", much in the same way that canonical writings are referred to as "Scripture".² The second pertinent formula is that which introduces the unidentified quotation of 46.2, with *γέγραπται*, one of the most common formulae used to introduce authoritative quotations from Scripture.

It is just possible, of course, that these formulae are of no special import. The word *γραφή* and the verb *γέγραπται* can be used in a neutral sense without bearing the connotation of divine origin for the material in question.³ Nevertheless this does not seem to be the most satisfactory explanation for the non-canonical quotations of either Clement, Barnabas (4.3; 16.5), or Hermas (*Vis.* II, 3, 4). The way in which these quotations are used gives little cause for regarding them as distinct from clearly canonical quotations. Moreover, so far as Clement is concerned, there is one further formula to be mentioned, which seems to confer the highest possible concept of inspiration upon a non-canonical writing. The quotation in 8.3 is introduced with the words *προστιθείς καὶ γνώμην ἀγαθὴν* following a quotation from the canonical Ezekiel. The latter quotation is introduced with the words *καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ δεσπότης τῶν ἀπάντων περὶ μετανοίας ἐλάλησεν μετὰ ὄρκου*, and it is therefore *ὁ δεσπότης* which serves as the subject for the participle *προστιθείς*. If, as we have argued,⁴ our quotation

¹ We may note, however, that in both instances the quotations follow quotations from canonical books of the OT without any indication that writings of any lesser worth are being quoted. Thus 17.6 has *καὶ πάλιν λέγει* and 29.3 *καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει* (*ἐτέρῳ τόπῳ* often refers to canonical books).

² The use of the demonstrative pronoun *αὕτη* with *γραφή* may possibly suggest that what is referred to is simply a familiar piece of literature, rather than "Scripture" in the more technical sense. Yet this seems rather improbable, the more so since nearly the same quotation appears independently in 2 Cl. 11.2f., where it is introduced as *ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος*.

³ See G. Schrenk's article on *γράφω*, etc., in *TDNT* I, 742-773. Schrenk refers to instances where the term *γραφή* implies no more than "literature" and where "no particular claim is involved". He adds that "the situation is basically the same in the post-apostolic fathers", apparently believing that no special claim is involved in the formulae in Clement and Barnabas, to which he refers (p. 757). Cf. Zahn, *GNK* I, 87f.

⁴ See above, p. 90f.

derives from an apocryphal Ezekiel, Clement clearly regards the book as of the highest character, and certainly on a par with the canonical books. But since we may be confronted here with an interpolated canonical Ezekiel, this particular argument cannot be pressed.

We may without difficulty visualize the situation which the Church found itself in at the end of the first century. The Church had received as Scripture, via the LXX, the tried and tested Scriptures of the Jews: the Law, the Prophets, and a number of Writings. But in addition it received via the LXX a body of Jewish writings of uncertain—because varying—number, which had been translated into Greek.¹ Indeed, it is perhaps misleading to speak of “the Septuagint” in Clement’s day, for the LXX did not yet exist as the clearly defined collection of writings we know today by that name. Instead, we must speak merely of a number of Jewish writings in Greek translation. There was hesitancy as to the exact status of some of these writings, not only among the Christians, but among the Jews themselves. Doubtless opinions varied from community to community concerning their claim to canonicity and their status in relation to the Law and the Prophets. There was, in fact, no guide to determine which should be finally accepted and which finally rejected.

Towards the end of the century the Jamnia deliberations established a closed canon for the Jews and eliminated from consideration all additional apocryphal and apocalyptic writings which had previously been candidates for possible admission to canonicity.² For the Christians, on the other hand, Jamnia was irrelevant and no consensus was reached for some time concerning the extent of the canon. In the interim, the tests applied were probably subjective and utilitarian: Did the writing possess a *prima facie* claim to inspiration together with a compatibility with the Christian message, and a usefulness in

¹ Swete gives the most probable explanation for the initial mixing of canonical writings with non-canonical writings, when he points to the fact that initially all the writings were on papyrus rolls which were kept in boxes. Eventually certain writings became associated by virtue of having been kept together. *An Introduction to the OT in Greek*, p. 225f. Presumably this confusion became perpetuated with the early use of the codex. Cf. B. M. Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York, 1957), p. 177f.; W. O. E. Oesterley, *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha* (London, 1935), p. 4.

² A. Jepsen has pointed out, however, that the exact contents of the Jewish canon in the Diaspora remained uncertain even until the third and fourth centuries. “Zur Kanongeschichte des Alten Testaments”, *ZAW* 71 (1959), 114-136.

applying that message to the people addressed? It must be remembered that the early Church was not critical in these matters. It was engrossed in proclaiming a message, and it was prone to accept rather than exclude, especially when the message in question was regarded as true.¹ At the same time, the fact that these non-canonical writings are quoted so infrequently may reflect the measure of hesitancy with which these writings were received in certain quarters.

Clement, then, we regard as being the earliest Christian writer (with the possible exception of Jude) to reflect this situation, in the use of a somewhat wider OT canon.² Eventually these various apocalyptic and pseudepigraphal writings passed into disuse by way of conformity to the Hebrew canon. The Apocrypha, however, primarily because of their association with the LXX, never managed to be completely repressed, even to the present day.³

C. INTERPRETATION

It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of the OT in Clement's epistle. This is true not simply because of the large number of OT quotations used by Clement, nor even primarily because of Clement's view concerning the inspiration of the OT writings, but because virtually the whole of Clement's argument is drawn from, and thus rests upon, the teaching of the OT. For Clement the OT is a thoroughly Christian

¹ Cf. C. C. Torrey's remark: "In so far as it was religious and edifying, it was divinely inspired ... and the manner of quoting or alluding to it is likely to be the same as in the case of the canonical books". *The Apocryphal Literature* (New Haven, 1945), p. 18. However, Torrey's contention that the writings could be regarded as divinely inspired and "profitable for instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3.16), and yet not held to be on a par with the books of the Hebrew canon, seems a rather forced conjecture, at least so far as the Apostolic Fathers are concerned.

² Cf. Swete who writes: "When Origen and the Greek fathers who follow him fix the number of the books at twenty-two or twenty-four, they follow, not the earlier tradition of the Church, but the corrected estimate of Christian scholars who had learned it from Jewish teachers. An earlier tradition is represented by the line of Christian writers, beginning with Clement of Rome, who quoted the 'Apocryphal' books apparently without suspecting that they were not part of the Canon". *An Introduction to the OT in Greek*, p. 224.

³ See Sundberg's article "The Protestant Old Testament Canon: Should It Be Re-examined?" *CBQ* 28 (1966), 194-203. The answer given is affirmative on the basis of the fact that the Church did not inherit a closed canon from Jesus and the Apostles.

book which is directly pertinent to the contemporary problems of the Church in Corinth. Indeed, so timeless is the OT revelation for Clement that the adjective "Old" would doubtless have seemed singularly inappropriate to him.

Harnack has expressed the importance of the OT for Clement in the following well chosen words: "Das Christentum des Clemensbriefs erkennt seine von Gott gegebene vollständige und suffiziente Grundlage im A.T. und will daher nichts anderes sein als Religion dieses Buchs... Dieses Christentum identifiziert sich einfach mit der Religion des A.T."¹ Since the God of the OT is the same God who is revealed in Christ (cf. 35.2; 42.2), the materials of the OT may without difficulty be appropriated by the Church for its own instruction and edification. Clement's use of the OT is largely modelled on the thought expressed by Paul when he wrote *ταῦτα δὲ τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν ἐκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν, εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήγγηκεν* (1 Cor. 10.11).

While we cannot here enter into a detailed examination of the subject, it may be useful to outline Clement's interpretation of the OT. Owing to the particular importance of the OT in implementing Clement's argument, a full analysis of his interpretation of the OT would amount to nothing less than an exposition of the whole epistle. We shall accordingly confine ourselves to the interpretation of the OT regarding key subjects, and a look at Clement's basic methodology in approaching the OT.

The first subject to which we turn our attention is Christ. Clearly, through the entire epistle Christ holds a pre-eminent position.² Christ is, for Clement, the highest source of revelation (see especially 36.1f.), and the authority of Christ's words is equal to, if not greater than, the authority of the OT (cf. 13.2; 46.8). What then is the relationship between the revelation of the OT and the revelation of Christ, and to what extent does Clement find Christ in the OT?

The first thing to be noticed is that Clement regards Christ himself as the speaker in certain OT passages. In 22.1 Clement writes *ταῦτα δὲ πάντα βεβαιοῖ ἢ ἐν χριστῷ πίστις · καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου οὕτως προσκαλεῖται ἡμᾶς*, whereupon he quotes

¹ *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 66. Harnack here goes further than Wrede who had written that "diese Verwertung und Schätzung [des AT] für die christliche Gesamthaltung des Verfassers wesentlich ist". *Op. cit.*, p. 59.

² An excellent summary of the epistle's teaching concerning Christ is available in Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, pp. 71-76.

Ps. 33.12-18 and Ps. 31.10. The quoted passages have no direct bearing on Christ's own person or work, containing the most general type of ethical and religious paraenesis. In 16.15ff., following a quotation of the whole of Is. 53, Clement quotes Ps. 21.7-9 under the rubric *καὶ πάλιν αὐτὸς φησίν*. Ps. 22 (Heb.), however, is a well known Messianic Psalm, and the attribution of the words to Christ is readily understandable. From these examples, it is clear that Clement would have regarded Christ as the speaker in the larger part of the OT.

If Christ speaks in the OT, so also does the OT speak about Christ and his work. Is. 53 is quoted as a prophetic description, *καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐλάλησεν*, of the suffering of Christ, particularly as an example of the greatest humility. Although no quotations are given, it is said of the prophets Elijah, Elisha and Ezekiel, that *περιεπάτησαν κηρύσσοντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ χριστοῦ* (17.1). In addition to the use of Ps 22 (Heb.) mentioned above, passages from two further Messianic Psalms (2 and 110 [Heb.]) as well as a passage from Ps. 104 (Heb.) are quoted in chapter 36 as referring to Christ. In the choice of these last three quotations, Clement has undoubtedly been influenced by Heb. 1, to which he alludes immediately prior to the quotations. These are the only quotations in Clement's epistle which are explicitly said to refer to Christ. It is interesting to note how similar in this connection Clement's usage of the OT is to the pattern found in the NT.¹ Clement stands at one with the NT writers in seeing Christ in the OT, and could, if the occasion presented itself, probably have quoted many other of the same OT passages so commonly used in the NT in referring to Christ.

The second subject we are concerned with is the Church. How far does Clement go in identifying the Church with Israel in the OT? In 29.1 Clement refers to the Father *ὃς ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἡμᾶς ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ*, and then proceeds to cite passages from Deuteronomy and an apocryphal source (? Apocryphal Ezekiel) which both refer to the election of Israel. The election of the latter, for Clement, amounts to nothing less than the election of the Church (cf. also 30.1).² This is

¹ Most of Clement's quotations find their place among the key OT passages which Dodd has described constituting the "substructure of NT theology". *According to the Scriptures*, p. 107f.

² Grant is correct when he writes "God has elected both the old Israel and the new (cf. 1 Pet. 2.9) or, it would be better to say, there is only one Israel, culminating in the 'flock of Christ' ". *AF* II, 55. Cf. Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 112.

simply an extension of the fact that Clement regards the OT as the Church's own book. From this it follows that what is written there is written for the Church. Thus when Clement is arguing the legitimacy of the appointment of bishops and deacons by the Apostles, he writes (42.5) : καὶ τοῦτο οὐ καινῶς · ἐκ γὰρ δὴ πολλῶν χρόνων ἐγγράπτο περὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ διακόνων, whereupon he quotes Is. 60.17 with *ad hoc* variants. Here is prophetic anticipation of the contemporary Church and its needs. Related to this is the quotation in 3.1 where Dt. 32.15 is applied to the situation at Corinth with the formula καὶ ἐπετελέσθη τὸ γεγραμμένον. It seems unlikely, however, that Clement regarded this passage as a specific prophecy of the dissension in the Corinthian Church. Rather, we seem to have here a general "fulfilment", more in the nature of typology than prophecy.¹ The quotations of Cl. 15 are similar in that they describe Israel's hypocrisy which has reappeared at Corinth, although this is not made so explicit, nor is the term "fulfilment" used.

It is obvious, however, that even when no explicit indications are given, the direct application of OT quotations to the Church establishes the continuity which exists for Clement between Israel and the Church. In 8.5, after citing a series of OT passages on the necessity of repentance, Clement writes πάντας οὖν τοὺς ἀγαπητοὺς αὐτοῦ βουλόμενος μετανοίας μετασχεῖν ἐστήριξεν τῷ παντοκρατορικῷ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ. The quoted passages thus have τοὺς ἀγαπητούς, i.e. Christians, in mind.² The same may be said for the great amount of paraenetic material : written originally to Israel, it is applied directly and without hesitation to the Church by Clement. Thus the Church of the present and the Israel of the OT merge ; the Church finds in God's dealing with Israel its own prehistory and in the OT timeless revelation addressed to itself.³

The third subject which we want to consider is the kerygma. In what measure does Clement find the basic elements of the early aposto-

¹ Against R. P. C. Hanson, who argues the opposite. *Allegory and Event* (London, 1959), p. 100.

² Cf. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

³ Cf. J. Klevinghaus, who puts the matter well : "Einerseits bezieht sich die Kirche auf das atl. Geschehen als auf ihren Ursprung. Im AT ist von den Vätern der Kirche erzählt. Andererseits ist die atl. Geschichte in die christliche Geschichte hineinbezogen. Sie liegt in einer Ebene mit dem gegenwärtigen Geschehen in der Kirche, ist dasselbe, ist 'christliches' Geschehen". *Die theologische Stellung der Apostolischen Väter zur alttestamentlichen Offenbarung* (Gütersloh, 1948), p. 70.

lic message¹ in the OT? Clement's epistle, it must be admitted, consists almost exclusively of exhortation, and thus presupposes rather than elaborates the basic content of the kerygma. Nonetheless, there are a few interesting places where Clement draws out basic points of the Christian message from his OT quotations. Perhaps the most significant of these is in chapter 12, where Clement sees in Rahab's scarlet cord a sign of "redemption through the blood of the Lord": *καὶ προσέθεντο αὐτῇ δοῦναι σημεῖον, ὅπως ἐκκρεμάσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτῆς κόκκινον, πρόδηλον ποιούντες, ὅτι διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου λύτρωσις ἔσται πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν καὶ ἐλπίζουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν* (12.7). Although not strictly relevant to the argument he is pursuing, Clement cannot resist this interesting bit of allegorical exegesis, adding: *ὁρᾶτε, ἀγαπητοί, ὅτι οὐ μόνον πίστις, ἀλλὰ καὶ προφητεία ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ γέγονεν*. In chapter 8 Clement gives several quotations which contain the promise of forgiveness of sins. Clement, however, is intent on stressing the necessity of repentance and thus does not indicate that the forgiveness of sins referred to comes through the work of Christ, though he would unquestionably have interpreted the passages in this way. We may compare the quotation of Ps. 31.1f. in 50.6 concerning the blessing of forgiveness, to which Clement adds the words *οὗτος ὁ μακαρισμὸς ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐκλελεγμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*. In chapter 16, where Is. 53 (as well as a few verses from Ps. 22) is quoted, Clement is especially interested in the humility of Christ and thus does not elaborate upon the soteriological significance which the passage surely had for him. The same holds true for the quotation of Ps. 51 in chapter 18, where the interest is again humility rather than the kerygmatic significance of the passage.

An additional element of the kerygma can be seen in a few quotations in Clement which are prophecies concerning the coming of the Lord (29.3ff; 34.3; 50.4), the last of these being applied to the coming of Christ in the capacity of Judge. In 50.4 a composite quotation from Is. 26.20 and Ezk. 37.12 referring to *ὀργή* and *θυμός* is prefaced by the phrase *ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. In 26.2f. Clement quotes from the Psalms and from Job, interpreting the passages as prophecies of the resurrection believers.

The number of quotations used by Clement which are explicitly

¹ As outlined, for example, by Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (London, 1936).

interpreted as referring to Christ, the Church, and the components of the kerygma, is small in comparison with the number of quotations which is used to support the main, hortatory argument of the epistle. These quotations, consisting almost exclusively of warnings, promises, examples and exhortations, compose the large bulk of quotation material used by Clement. From this alone, it is clear the extent to which the content of the epistle and the choice of quotations is controlled by the dominating purpose of the epistle. There is no interpretation to speak of in the use of these quotations.¹ They are taken from the OT and applied directly to the situation which the epistle confronts. This direct application is made possible, as we have seen, by the relation which Clement perceives between Israel and the Church. The OT in effect becomes a "source-book for Christian behaviour",² and Christianity becomes in large measure indistinguishable from the Jewish piety of the OT.

Having examined Clement's interpretation of the OT in terms of the key subjects of Christianity what can we say concerning the methodology of his OT interpretation? For the most part, the interpretation of the OT in the Apostolic Fathers is uninteresting,³ and apart from some far-fetched allegorizing in Barnabas, receives very little space in discussions of the history of interpretation.⁴ As a result of Clement's

¹ R. M. Grant writes concerning the use of the OT in Clement's epistle: "It can hardly be called exegesis, since his purpose in writing the Corinthians is entirely practical and he uses the Old Testament only as a storehouse of moral examples". *The Letter and the Spirit* (London, 1957), p. 59. E. Flesseman-Van Leer writes "about the interpretation of scripture nothing is said. This, however, is hardly surprising, for there is no indication that the possibility of divergent exegesis is ever thought of. Clement, for the most part, takes the quoted texts in their common, literal sense and those few to which he gives christological application had already been used in that way". *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church* (Assen, 1953), p. 20f. Cf. G. Bardy, "Interprétation chez les Pères", *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément IV*, 570.

² Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

³ F. W. Farrar, however, seems to overstate the matter when he writes of the Apostolic Fathers "In matters of interpretation they show so little title to authority that their views have been abandoned by the whole Christian world". *History of Interpretation* (London, 1886), p. 166.

⁴ Cf. J. D. Wood, *The Interpretation of the Bible* (London, 1958), pp. 30-39; R. M. Grant, *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible* (London, 1965; formerly published as *The Bible in the Early Church*, New York, 1948), pp. 43-45; *idem*, *The Letter and the Spirit*, pp. 58-62; F. W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, p. 165ff. The Apostolic Fathers are not even mentioned so far as their OT exegesis is concerned in the surveys edited by C. W. Dugmore, *The Interpretation of the Bible* (London, 1944), and D. E. Nineham, *The Church's Use of the Bible* (London, 1963).

continual use of the OT for ethical paraenesis, his "exegesis" tends to be very much of the same type throughout the epistle,¹ and the methodology straight-forward and uninteresting.²

In looking at Clement's methodology, we shall discuss three major types of interpretation: literal, typological, and allegorical. Without question the more important of these categories for Clement's epistle is the first. It is surprising how much OT material Clement can quote in its literal sense, without modification, and apply directly to the problems of the Church. There is no need for interpretation with these quotations. Their meaning is plainly evident from the words themselves, and it is not different from what it was to the original addressees. The warnings, promises, and exhortations spoken to Israel hold equally true for the Church.

Of special importance under the category of literal interpretation is Clement's fondness for listing OT personages as examples of faith, humility, jealousy, etc. This is one of the main ways in which Clement uses the OT, and Clement even employs special terminology to call attention to the "pattern" or "example". Thus Clement uses *ὑποδείγματα* to refer to OT examples in 5.1 (*ἀρχαῖα ὑποδείγματα*); 46.1; 63.1; to Peter and Paul in 5.1; other Christian martyrs in 6.1; and even to Gentile kings and rulers in 55.1 (cf. the use of the synonym *ὑπογραμμός* in 5.7; 16.17; 33.8).³ Clement's fondness for this literary device, particularly as used with OT figures, inspired Wrede's apt description of Clement's OT as "das grosse ethische Musterbuch".⁴

This listing of OT examples for homiletic purposes, while somewhat unusual due to the extent to which Clement uses it, is not unique to Clement's epistle in the early Christian literature.⁵ In the NT notable

¹ O. Linton, in a brief analysis of Clement's interpretation of the Psalms, discusses five ways in which Clement uses the Psalms: (1) historical; (2) paraenetic and pedagogic; (3) hymnic; (4) christological; and (5) prophetic. "Interpretation of the Psalms in the Early Church", *Studia Patristica* IV, TU 79 (Berlin, 1961), 146. This analysis is perhaps too refined, since in reality the first three uses are all paraenetic, and the last two prophetic.

² "When we consider the exegetical methods of the Apostolic Fathers, we find that of Clement very matter-of-fact". Grant, *The Letter and the Spirit*, p. 59.

³ A short but useful discussion of *ὑπόδειγμα* can be found in Grant, *The Letter and the Spirit*, p. 125.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

⁵ When Michel finds in Clement "eine neue Art homiletischer Verwertung des A.T.s", he primarily has in mind the contrast to Paul's use of the OT. *Paulus und seine Bibel*, p. 201. Yet compare 1 Cor. 10.6,11.

examples of the same homiletic use of OT ὑποδείγματα are found, e.g. in Heb. 11; Jas. 2; 2 Pet. 2. The Christian writers are probably dependent upon Jewish practice for this homiletic convention,¹ and it is not difficult to believe that Clement has borrowed the practice from the synagogue.² Indeed, it appears that Clement not only borrows the device itself from Jewish sources, but that he also borrows whole series of examples intact from Jewish tradition.³

It must be admitted that the majority of OT quotations in the epistle bear a literal interpretation which, if taken out of the total context, is more Jewish than it is specifically Christian. This is only to say that the epistle is filled with a type of moralizing to which few Jews would have taken exception; this is as much true of the content as it is of the form or method of Clement's scriptural argument. While this literal interpretation is in itself exegetically uninteresting,⁴ it does illustrate a viewpoint which is foundational for Christian typological and allegorical interpretation of the OT. This, as we have seen, consists primarily in seeing Israel and the Church as a continuity—on which point Clement seems almost to go too far. The exact relation between Israel and the Church is nowhere expressed, but the implication of Clement's use of the OT is that the Church is virtually equated with Israel⁵ and,

¹ Cf. Sirach 44-50; 1 Macc. 2.51ff; for the homiletic practice in the Synagogue see Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, IV/1, 177ff. However, the possibility of Hellenistic influence must not be discounted. See Thyen, who describes the phenomenon as a "spezifisch-hellenistischen Art der Beweisführung". *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie*, p. 76; cf. pp. 40ff; 110ff.

² See especially Wrede, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-74. Cf. H. F. von Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel* (Tübingen, 1968), p. 82.

³ K. Beyschlag writes: "Clemens hat die unter das Leitmotiv ζῆλος und φθόνος gestellte alttestamentliche Beispielreihe nicht selbst gebildet, sondern als Ganze aus der Tradition überkommen". *Clemens Romanus und der Fröhenkatholizismus*, p. 131. Beyschlag has thoroughly examined the early chapters of Clement's epistle and finds considerable evidence of dependence upon various traditional materials, including "der spätjüdischen Adamshaggada". (p. 52) See also, J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* (Paris, 1958), p. 54. For the influence of Haggadic tradition on Diaspora preaching, cf. Thyen, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

⁴ Cf. G. T. Armstrong who describes Clement's use of Genesis as follows: "Clemens von Rom bietet ein typisches Beispiel für eine ganz monotone Form der Genesisauslegung. Er stellt eine Reihe bzw. Bildergalerie von moralischen Beispielen auf, die zeigen sollen, wie die Güte belohnt und das Böse bestraft wird. Clemens lässt nur den Wortsinn der Genesis sprechen, während Barnabas den sensus spiritualis erarbeitet". *Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche* (Tübingen, 1962), p. 15.

⁵ L. Goppelt describes the situation well. Speaking primarily of Clement, but also of

what is perhaps even more important, the religion of the OT is regarded as virtually identical with that of the Church.¹

Yet Clement writes as a Christian, and it is this fact that makes his literal interpretation of the OT so interesting and unique.² Clement's epistle contains a fair amount of distinctly Christian doctrine and a large number of allusions to NT writings. One cannot help wondering why Clement does not employ more of a distinctively Christian interpretation of the OT. A view of the consistency of revelation such as Clement's is the foundation for the typology of the NT writers before him³ as well as the allegorizing of the Fathers after him,⁴ yet little of either can be found in Clement's epistle. When Clement does draw Christian doctrine from the OT he usually does so, as we have seen above, by literal interpretation of what he regards as plainly prophetic.

Few words are more difficult to define than "typology" and "allegory", if only because they are used in so many ways by different writers. We here distinguish "typology" from "allegory" by defining the former as the perception of a correspondence or pattern within actual events separated in time, and the latter as the perception of a hidden meaning in a passage of Scripture which is thereupon said to foreshadow a later situation. The essential difference is that typology is tied to the historical actuality of events occurring in a particular sequence; allegory, on the other hand, not being limited to historical patterns, gives

2 Clement and Hermas, he writes "Diese Schriften ignorieren nicht nur die zeitgenössische Judenschaft, sondern auch das geschichtliche Hervorgehen des Christentums aus dem Judentum, vor allem aber sein heilsgeschichtliches Verhältnis zum Volk des Alten Bundes. Sie sehen nicht mehr die Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes gegenüber der des Alten, sondern nur noch eine Gemeinde aus Gerechten vor und nach Christus. Das A.T. ist nicht die Urkunde des Alten Bundes, sondern das Offenbarungsbuch dieser Erwählten. *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh, 1954), p. 238. Cf. Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, p. 82.

¹ Cf. A. W. Ziegler, *Neue Studien zum ersten Klemensbrief* (München, 1958), p. 48f. Wrede, *op. cit.*, p. 97; Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 70.

² Wrede rightly notes "keines stellt das A.T. in gleichem Umfange in den Dienst der Paränese und der praktisch-religiösen Belehrung". *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

³ G. W. H. Lampe writes "the use of an Old Testament narrative for the purpose of moral admonition presupposes the basic assumption which underlies typology proper—namely, that the history of God's people and of his dealings with them is a single continuous process in which a uniform pattern may be discerned". "Typological Exegesis", *Theology* 56 (1953), 201.

⁴ Cf. Moore, *Judaism* I, 250.

much more scope for an active imagination—not to say creativity—in detecting parallels between the past and present.¹ In view of the large place given to typology in the use of the OT by the NT writers, it seems strange that typology should be of such little importance in an epistle containing such an abundance of OT quotations as Clement's. The most natural explanation of this lies in the nature of the material quoted, and thus ultimately in the purpose of the epistle. In fulfilling the latter, Clement finds the direct application of paraenetic materials the most satisfactory method. Typology is not only unnecessary, but would be less effective than the direct transference to the Church of the appeal of Scripture itself. In one place this direct application seems very similar to, and justifiable only on the basis of, typology. In 3.1 Clement quotes Dt. 32.15 and refers the words to the grave situation at Corinth with the introductory words *πᾶσα δόξα καὶ πλατυσμός ἐδόθη ὑμῖν, καὶ ἐπετελέσθη τὸ γεγραμμένον*. It is unlikely that Clement would have denied the reference of these words in the first place to Israel. The fulfilment he has in mind is not that of direct prophecy, but of the recurring pattern of events: as in the Song of Moses the Beloved was richly blessed but then rebelled, so in Corinth has the same sequence of events occurred.² The same may be said of the allusions to Isaiah in 3.3 and 3.4 which immediately follow. The words *οὕτως ἐπηγέρθησαν οἱ ἄτιμοι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐντίμους ... οἱ νέοι ἐπὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους* (cf. Is. 3.5) were particularly appropriate in describing the same type of historical reality in Corinth. In chapter 43, the story of Nu. 17 is seen as a parallel to the establishment of spiritual leadership in the Church in answer to rebellion in the congregation. This is very similar to typology although the connection is not made specific. It may also be said concerning a number of the examples or illustrations used by Clement that in their application to the situation at Corinth there lies an implicit typology.³ Clement, however, does not develop his argument in such a way as to utilize the typology.

¹ This basic differentiation of "typology" from "allegory" is commonly accepted by writers on the subject. See G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe, *Essays on Typology* (London, 1957); R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event* (London, 1959); Lampe, "Typological Exegesis", *Theology* 56 (1953), 201-208; J. Daniélou, "The Fathers and the Scriptures", *Theology* 57 (1954), 83-89.

² Cf. M. Meinhold, "Geschehen und Deutung im Ersten Clemensbrief", *ZKG* 58 (1939), 94f.

³ Hanson refers to these examples as "types" in the Philonic sense of the word. *Allegory and Event*, p. 100.

Just as typology is not exploited by Clement, little use is made of allegorical interpretation. Clement's view of the divine inspiration of the OT writings is the very type of view that lends itself to attributing a hidden significance to every detail of the text.¹ Yet there occur in Clement's epistle only two instances of what may properly be called allegorical exegesis. The first, and most notorious of these, is Clement's interpretation of Rahab's scarlet cord as a prophecy of redemption through the blood of Christ (12.7).² Here a detail—the colour of the cord Rahab is to suspend from her window—seemingly insignificant to the narrative, is made a prophecy of the shed blood of Christ. This is not a parallel rooted in the historical events themselves. Despite a certain similarity between Rahab's salvation from destruction and the redemption of Christians, an insignificant detail is seized upon as indicating much more than immediately meets the eye. This is clearly an allegorical approach to interpretation, although it is not allegorization in the strictest sense wherein the original historical reference is denied. The second piece of allegorical exegesis is found in 48.2ff., where, quoting a passage from Ps. 117.19f., which refers to the "gate" the righteous shall enter, Clement understands the "gate" to be the way which is "in Christ". Thus in a passage which ostensibly refers to gates, whether figurative or not, Clement finds specific references to Christ as the entrance to the Christian life.³

Despite these examples of allegorization, it must be admitted that Clement's allegorical interpretation is of a rather elementary kind. Unlike Barnabas, which contains a great amount of fanciful allegorization of OT texts, Clement has no conception of a *γνώσις* which gives a special exegetical insight concerning the true meaning of the Scriptures.⁴ It is true that Clement knows of a *γνώσις* (cf. 1.2; 36.2; 40.1; 41.4; 48.5). However, it is not esoteric, but possessed by Clement's readers, and not related to OT exegesis. The closest Clement comes to this viewpoint is in 40.1, where the clause *ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς τὰ*

¹ Cf. Oesterley, "The Exegesis of the Old Testament", *Record and Revelation* (Oxford, 1938), p. 404.

² See. J. Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality* (London, 1960), p. 245f. Clement is the earliest writer so to interpret Rahab's scarlet cord. It became a popular interpretation with later Fathers of the Church. It occurs in Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 111); Irenaeus (*Haer.* 4, 20); Origen (*Mt.* 27.28); etc. See Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

³ Cf. Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, p. 100; Lampe, "The Exposition and Exegesis of Scripture to Gregory the Great", *CHB* II (Cambridge, 1969), p. 167.

⁴ For "exegetical gnosis" in Barnabas, see R. A. Kraft, *AF* III, 22ff.

βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως refers not to allegorical or typological exegesis but simply to the insight gained from a literal interpretation of the counsel of God contained in the OT Scriptures.¹ Clement's concept of *γνώσις*, like his interpretation of the OT, is clearly different from that found in Barnabas.²

It may be seen, then, that Clement's interpretation of the OT is, for the most part, anomalous in early Christianity. While typology and allegory flourished,³ it is remarkable that Clement has recourse to these methods only rarely.⁴ It is clear, however, that Clement also regards Christ as speaking from the OT, and the OT as speaking about both Christ and the Church. Yet the majority of passages so understood by Clement are interpreted as literal predictions. The most likely explanation of Clement's predominantly literal interpretation is the paraenetic purpose of the epistle. Even the instances where Christ and the Church are seen in the OT, the motivation is a paraenetic one (humility, church order, etc.) rather than a kerygmatic one. There is no reason to disbelieve that, writing with other goals in mind, Clement would very probably have employed much more typological and allegorical exegesis than he does in the present epistle.⁵ His use of the Rahab story shows that he was not opposed to a more imaginative type of exegesis.

The conclusion to which we are led is that the single most important

¹ Harnack writes that for Clement the clause means "ausschliesslich oder hauptsächlich das rechte Verständnis des A.T. in theistischer und moralischer Hinsicht". *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 64.

² On this see especially Wrede, *op. cit.*, p. 81ff. Lampe appears wrongly to classify Clement with Barnabas in regarding gnosis as a special gift of the interpreter to discern spiritual allegories. "The Exposition and Exegesis of Scripture to Gregory the Great", *CHB* II, 159.

³ See W. G. Kümmel, "Schriftauslegung im Urchristentum", *RGK* V, 1518f.

⁴ Campenhausen has pointed out the uniqueness of Clement: "Und unerschöpflich werden die Möglichkeiten, sobald man die typologische und allegorische Auslegung überblickt, die schon Paulus vertraut war. Der Verfasser des I. Klemensbriefes hält sich hierbei noch zurück; aber in den übrigen Zeugnissen dieser Zeit findet sie sich nahezu überall, wo das Alte Testament benutzt wird. *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, p. 82.

⁵ Another writing from the hand of Clement, which was not absorbed in the correction of church dissension, would doubtless have been of great assistance in giving a more balanced view of Clement's exegetical methods. In particular, one would be interested to know Clement's assessment of contemporary Judaism. How would he have reacted to the Epistle of Barnabas, or better, what kind of an epistle would he have written with the same task in mind?

factor in understanding Clement's use of the OT is the immediate purpose of the epistle. The choice, the interpretation, and the application of OT texts are governed by the urgent necessity of meeting the problems of the Corinthian Church.¹ In correction of the scandalous situation at Corinth, Clement skillfully employs the most effective weapon known to him, the direct application of the timeless oracles of God.

¹ Ziegler comes to a similar conclusion: "Klemens ordnet und gebraucht seine Beweismittel so, wie es ihm sein Friedenszweck vorschreibt. Sein Friedenszweck beherrscht und bestimmt alles". *Neue Studien zum ersten Klemensbrief*, p. 45.

PART TWO

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN CLEMENT'S EPISTLE

CHAPTER FIVE

CLEMENT'S KNOWLEDGE OF SYNOPTIC MATERIAL

In comparison with the massive use of Old Testament quotations in Clement's epistle, the use of New Testament writings is slight. Quotations from the latter are rare and never verbatim. Yet at the same time there is a significant amount of allusive material which indicates Clement's familiarity with certain of these writings, and which warrants careful examination. The evidence afforded by Clement's epistle is of course highly important, for in AD 95 the availability and authority—not to mention the very existence in some cases—of the New Testament writings is a difficult question which remains open to debate.

Although Clement does not cite any of the New Testament books by name, or employ any of the customary introductory formulae encountered in his Old Testament quotations, he does seem to show an acquaintance with much of the New Testament. If he does not indicate a knowledge of our Synoptic Gospels, he is at least plainly familiar with the "synoptic tradition" behind them or parallel with them; he knows, as well, the Epistle to the Hebrews, a number of Paul's Epistles, and probably Acts, 1 Peter and James. The task of determining the extent to which Clement did know our New Testament books however is made particularly difficult because of the allusory manner in which he uses them. This in itself indicates that in what follows, we shall have to be content in some instances with probability, and in others with mere possibility.

A. QUOTATIONS FROM THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION

Clement provides us with quotations of substantial length from the synoptic tradition only in two places: 13.2 and 46.8. Other contacts with the synoptic tradition, where they exist, are of a brief, allusive nature. These will be dealt with after the two main passages have been considered.

1. *Clement 13.2* (see accompanying synopsis on following page)

This citation occurs in the midst of exhortations to humility and its adjuncts gentleness and longsuffering, The proud, quarrelsome Corin-

SYNOPTIC GOSPELS
(Text of Nestle-Aland)

CLEMENT 13.2
(Text of A, but with
standardized spellings) ¹

	<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>
(a) ἐλεῦτε ἵνα ἐλεθῇτε ²	5.7 μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεθθήσονται.		6.36 γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν. 6.37c ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεθε.
(b) ἀφίετε ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν	6.14 εἰν γὰρ ἀφήτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος.	11.25b ἀφίετε εἰ τι ἔχετε κατὰ τινος, ἵνα καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφή ὑμῖν τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.	
(c) ὡς ποιείτε ³ οὕτως ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν	7.12 πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιείτε αὐτοῖς		6.31 καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ποιείτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως 6.38a δίδετε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν. 6.37a καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθήτε.
(d) ὡς δίδετε οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν ⁴			
(e) ὡς κρίνετε ⁵ οὕτως κριθήσεθε ⁶	7.1f. μὴ κρίνετε ἵνα μὴ κριθήτε. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε,		
(f) ὡς χρηστεύεσθε οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν ⁷			6.35c ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαπίστοις καὶ ποιητοῖς.
(g) ᾧ μέτρω μετρεῖτε ἐν αὐτῇ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. ⁸	7.2b καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρω μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.	4.24b ἐν ᾧ μέτρω μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν, καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.	6.38c ᾧ γὰρ μέτρω μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

(Notes found on following page.)

thians were sadly lacking in these basic Christian virtues. Clement accordingly calls special attention to the teaching of Jesus himself on this subject, reminding them of his very words, *μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, οὓς ἐλάλησεν διδάσκων ἐπιείκειαν καὶ μακροθυμίαν*.

The passage consists, in fact, of seven pointed maxims derived from the teaching of Jesus, stylistically arranged so that the first pair consists of imperatives followed by *ἵνα* clauses, and the remaining five of *ὥς ... οὕτως* comparisons (the fifth being made slightly more specific by the *ὅ μέρῳ ... ἐν αὐτῇ*). As will be seen from the synopsis, the material largely finds its parallels in the accounts of the Sermon on the Mount given in Mt. 5-7 and Lk. 6. The Marcan parallels are two rare instances where Mk. conveys material parallel to that of the Sermon on the Mount, and indeed, the words of Mk. 4.24b, *ἐν ᾧ μέρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν* afford us Mk.'s sole verbatim contact with the Synoptic account of the Sermon on the Mount. But while we are thus dealing with material found in the accounts of the Sermon on the Mount, immediately it must be noted that the Synoptic parallels are not verbatim for any of the maxims, and that the order of the maxims follows neither that of Mt. nor Lk. Moreover, and most importantly, at least one maxim (f) is completely without parallel in the Synoptics.

From the synopsis it can be seen that the saying (g) which is most closely paralleled is the only one found in all three of the Synoptics. Except for *ἐν αὐτῇ*, and the lack of the preposition *ἐν* before *ὅ μέρῳ*, Clement's wording would be identical with that of Mt. and Mk.;¹ Lk. further differs in having the compound verb *ἀντιμετρηθήσεται*.²

¹ There is considerable confusion as to the reading of the first line in Lk. Thus P 45, θ, it, sy* read τῷ αὐτῷ μέρῳ ὅ μετρεῖτε; C and the majority of later MSS read τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέρῳ ὅ μετρεῖτε. Mk. alone adds the words *καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν* (omitted by D, W).

² Lk. according to the original hand of B reads *μετρηθήσεται*, but this is probably a later harmonization with Mt. and Mk.

Notes to synopsis on preceding page:

¹ The variations in spelling are very minor and few, and are judged unimportant for the present purpose.

² L reads: *ut perveniat ad misericordiam*.

³ L reads: *quomodo aliis facitis*; K similarly adds "to men".

⁴ In Codex C, saying d is followed by g, thus giving the order: a, b, c, d, g, e, f.

⁵ L adds: *de aliis*.

⁶ L reads: *sic indicabitur de vobis*.

⁷ L omits maxim f completely.

⁸ C has *οὕτως* for *ἐν αὐτῇ*; S and K have *ἐν αὐτῷ*; L: *in eadem*.

Two other sayings find close parallels in the Synoptics: that concerning "judging" (e), and that concerning "giving" (d). The former has its counterpart in the words prohibiting judging found both in Mt. and Lk.¹ Mt., however, adds the words ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε which better parallels the nuance of Clement's ὡς ... οὕτως comparison. Indeed, it is remarkable that the form of Mt.'s words corresponds almost exactly with that of Clement's in his maxim on "measuring": ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῇ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. The saying concerning "giving" (d) is found, on the other hand, only in Lk. where instead of appearing as an ὡς ... οὕτως comparison it is the straightforward δίδοτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.

For the remainder of the sayings the parallels, where they exist, are not quite so close, being parallels more in thought than in wording. Thus one finds that in the only parallel to Clement's maxim on "being merciful" (a) the structure differs considerably although there is a substantial parallelism of thought or meaning.² Mt. presents it in the form of a beatitude; Clement in a concise imperative and ἵνα clause. Similarly, one finds the thought of the "forgiveness" maxim (b) in the context of the Sermon on the Mount found in Mt.,³ and at the same time in Mk. among Jesus' remarks concerning the withered fig tree. From the standpoint of grammatical structure, Mk. stands nearer to Clement, having an imperative followed by the ἵνα clause, whereas Mt. presents the same thought in the form of a conditional sentence. Both Mt. and Mk. specify in a general way those to be forgiven (Mt., τοῖς ἀνθρώποις; Mk., τινος); both refer to "your heavenly father" as the one who forgives the forgiver; and both refer to τὰ παραπτώματα. (In Mt. these refer to τοῖς ἀνθρώποις; in Mk. to the forgiver.) Clement, however, omits these details and presents the underlying thought as tersely as possible.

¹ Cf. Rom. 2.1-3; Jas. 5.9; 1 Cor. 11.3. The Western text of Lk. reads ἵνα μὴ κριθῇτε, probably a later harmonization with Mt.

² Cf. the same thought in the form of a rhetorical question in Mt. 18.33: οὐκ ἔδει καὶ σέ ἐλεῆσαι τὸν σύνδουλόν σου, ὡς καὶ γὰρ σέ ἡλέησα; Cf. also Jas. 2.13: ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνέλεος τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος.

³ Verse 15 of Mt. 6 repeats verse 14, but in the form of a negative. The thought also occurs as a negative condition in Mt. 18.35: οὕτως καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος ποιήσει ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ ἀφῇτε ἕκαστος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν καρδιῶν ὑμῶν. Thus the import of the maxim is found enshrined in the Parable of the Unforgiving Servant, indicating that such words must often have been on the lips of Jesus. Cf. also the same thought in the petition of the Lord's Prayer found in Mt. 6.12 and Lk. 11.4.

Even more remote is the relationship which exists between Clement's maxim on "doing" (c) and the parallels in Mt. and Lk. While the thought of this maxim may be similar to the Synoptic parallels, in this instance its form is entirely different. If the parallels are genuine, then Clement is here citing the Golden Rule,¹ but in a stylized form nowhere else encountered. The saying appears to have been patterned after the four sayings which it introduces and may well have been devised as an introductory epitome for just such a collection of maxims.² At the same time, because of Clement's terseness the maxim is not unambiguous and it is just possible that we have here, as in the sixth maxim, a saying of Jesus which ultimately lacks a true Synoptic parallel.³

It is commonly admitted that the maxim on "being kind" (f) is without parallel in the Synoptics. Lk. 6.36 gives the closely related saying: *γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρων ἐστίν*. This may seem to lend support to the hypothesis that Clement is using the Lucan passage, deriving the verb *χρηστεύομαι* from Lk.'s *χρηστός* (6.35). Yet in the latter case *χρηστός* is the character of God shown *ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀγαπίστους καὶ πονηροὺς*. This, however, hardly fits with Clement's statement, nor with the sentiment of the chain of maxims where the promises are made to those who have acted rightly.⁴ Here,

¹ Thus, H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin, 1957), p. 14; E. Massaux, *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée* (Louvain, 1950), p. 9f.; A. Resch, *Agrapha*¹, TU 5 (Leipzig, 1889), 139. The Golden Rule in its negative form is found in Did. 1.2, and it is added in negative form in the Western text of Acts 15.20 and 15.28.

² Bultmann has called attention to the peculiar structure of the whole collection of maxims. "No-one can doubt that this series of proverbs has come into being in regard to both form and content, by analogous formulation, no matter which parts one may identify as earlier or later". *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh (Oxford, 1963), p. 85.

³ If we regard the agent behind the passive verb *ποιθησεται* as God rather than man, the saying may refer not to the Golden Rule, but to the fact that God rewards a man according to his deeds, similar to the thought expressed by Jesus in Mt. 16.27 *καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἕκαστῳ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ*, a quotation from the LXX of Ps. 61.12 (cf. Pr. 24.12). Cf. also Rom. 2.6; 2 Cor. 5.10; Eph. 6.8; 2 Tim. 4.14; 1 Pet. 1.17; and Rev. 2.23. Although the primary reference would appear to be eschatological, this need not preclude a present application. Moreover, the deeds concerned are not merely those done in the direct service of God, but those done to one's fellow man, thus assuring the appropriateness of the maxim for Clement's purpose.

⁴ The two words *χρηστός* and *οἰκτιρμός* are linked together by Justin Martyr in *Apology* I, 15.13 and *Dialogue* 96.3. In the NT the verb *χρηστεύομαι* occurs only in 1 Cor. 13.4; cf. Rom. 2.4.

then, we are evidently confronted by an extra-canonical saying recorded by Clement.

From this comparison of Clement's quotation with parallel material in the Synoptic Gospels, it may be said that three sayings (g, e, d) are paralleled closely enough to suggest literary dependence as a possibility; for two other sayings (b, a) such a suggestion seems less plausible; for the remaining two (c, f) no convincing parallels exist and the second, at least, may be designated as extra-canonical.

Before any conclusions can be drawn, however, it is necessary to indicate the parallels to Clement's quotation which are known to exist in other (i.e. non-biblical) sources. The same collection of sayings, or part thereof, is found to occur both in Clement of Alexandria and Polycarp. Indeed, in the Alexandrian Clement's *Stromata* II, 91, 2, the entire passage occurs almost verbatim, the only difference being the substitution of ἀντιμετρηθήσεται for ἐν αὐτῇ μετρηθήσεται.¹ There can be no question but that Clement of Alexandria is citing his Roman namesake, and not giving evidence of an independent knowledge of the sayings. The Alexandrian is, in fact, very fond of quoting from Clement's epistle which he refers to by name (e.g. *Stromata* I, 38, 8; IV, 105, 1; V, 80, 1). Referring to Clement as an apostle (ὁ ἀπόστολος Κλήμης, *Stromata* IV, 105, 1), he makes use not only of Clement's own words, but also his peculiar combination of scripture texts (e.g. *Stromata* IV, 32, 2ff.), and his exegesis (e.g. *Stromata* VI, 64, 3, wrongly attributed to Barnabas).² Particularly noteworthy is the extended passage in *Stromata* IV, 105-119 where the Alexandrian presents what is virtually a *précis* of the Roman Clement's epistle. It may be concluded then that in Clement of Alexandria we have a witness to the text of Clement of Rome rather than an independent witness to the same group of sayings.³

¹ This substitution no doubt reflects the influence of Lk. 6.38. See P. M. Barnard, *The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria*, TS 5 (Cambridge, 1899), 40.

² For more detailed analyses of the use of the Roman Clement's epistle by Clement of Alexandria, see Lightfoot I, 1, 158ff.; and R. M. Grant, *AF* II (New York, 1965), 5f.

³ In his first edition of *Agrapha*, Resch argues that the two Clements were independent witnesses to a common Hebrew *Urtext*. TU 5 (Leipzig, 1889), 137. E. Jacquier argues that Clement of Alexandria would not have borrowed the sayings from the Roman Clement since he had access to the Gospels themselves. *Le Nouveau Testament dans L'Église Chrétienne*, I (Paris, 1911), 42. J. R. Harris also argues that "there is no reason to suppose one Clement is quoting the other". "The 'Logia' and the Gospels", *The Con-*

In Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians* 2.3 words very similar to our quotation in Clement are found :

μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῇτε ·
 ἀφίετε, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν ·
 ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῇτε ·
 ὃ μέτρω μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν ,

to which are added the words : καὶ [ὅτι] μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ καὶ οἱ διωκόμενοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Here we have four of the seven maxims given in Clement's citation. In relationship to the latter, they occur in the sequence : e, b, a, g. Of the four, only the third (a) is in exact verbatim agreement with Clement. The maxim on "judging" (e) is not found in the characteristic ὥς ... οὕτως comparison as we have it in Clement, but instead agrees word for word with the rendering in Mt. (7.1). The maxim on "forgiving" (b) lacks the characteristic ἵνα, and has ἀφεθήσεται for Clement's ἀφεθῇ. The final maxim (g) employs the compound verb ἀντιμετρηθήσεται thus agreeing exactly with the Lucan rendering against Clement's simple μετρηθήσεται. To these four maxims, Polycarp adds a combination of two Matthean Beatitudes, neither of which is found in Clement : Mt. 5.3a (but with Luke, omitting τῷ πνεύματι) and 5.10 (with minor variations). Consequently, the differences between the passages may be said to be not small : the loss of two characteristic forms (the ὥς ... οὕτως, and ἵνα), the verbal agreements with the Synoptics against Clement, and the presence of only four of the seven maxims given in very irregular order.

However, these dissimilarities by no means negate the similarity which exists between the sayings as found in Clement and Polycarp.¹ Indeed, when the similarity of the sayings is combined with two additional factors, a formidable argument can be made for Polycarp's dependence on Clement. The first of these is that while Polycarp

temporary Review, 72 (1897), 347. H. T. Andrews, however, successfully refuted Harris' contention, showing that the Alexandrian is dependent on Clement of Rome. "Professor Rendel Harris and the Urevangelium", *The Expository Times* 9 (1897-98), 94f.

¹ Polycarp's omission of certain of Clement's maxims has been explained as the result of the fact that they are without Gospel equivalents. Thus P. N. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge, 1936), p. 286. Köster, *op. cit.*, p. 117. This explanation, however, does not seem to be completely satisfactory since as we have seen only two of the three omitted maxims are lacking in the Synoptics (i.e., f and e); the third maxim (d) is, in fact, found closely paralleled in Lk. 6.38, and thus no reason exists for its omission.

nowhere refers to Clement, or his epistle, by name, there is little doubt but that he was very well acquainted with the epistle. His letter is filled with numerous allusions to Clement's epistle,¹ the latter having a purpose similar to his own, and thus providing a ready source of appropriate ideas and imageries. The second factor is found in the similarity of the introductory words in Clement and Polycarp. Clement has the longer reading: *μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, οὓς ἐλάλησεν διδάσκων ἐπιείκειαν καὶ μακροθυμίαν*; Polycarp, more simply: *μνημονεύοντες δὲ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων*. Strikingly, they employ the closely related verbs *μνημονεύω* and *μιμνήσκω*,² and both use the present participle: *διδάσκων*. On the basis, then, of the similarity of the maxims themselves, Polycarp's knowledge of Clement's epistle, and the similar words of introduction, many scholars have decided in favour of Polycarp's dependence on Clement, and thus against the presence in Polycarp of an independent witness to the maxims.³

Yet as pointed out above, the number, order, and wording of the maxims are so conspicuously dissimilar that not everyone has been swayed by the factors just mentioned. As for the first of these, Polycarp's knowledge of Clement's epistle by no means guarantees his dependence upon Clement as the source of the maxims;⁴ secondly, Polycarp's use of *μνημονεύω* in the words of introduction may simply reflect a common method of citing extra-canonical oral tradition (as in Acts 20.35, introducing a maxim found also in Cl. 2.1), rather

¹ See the full compilation in Lightfoot I, 1, 149-153. While a considerable number of these allusions may well be fortuitous, it seems impossible to avoid the force of all of them.

² This verb also serves an introductory function in Cl. 46.7, Acts 20.35 and 2 Cl. 17.3. See below, p. 272f.

³ Lightfoot I, 2, 52; II, 3, 325; Köster, *op. cit.*, p. 115f.; W. Bauer, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief*, HZNT, *Die Apostolischen Väter* II (Tübingen, 1920), 286; Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 286. The differences between the sayings as found in Polycarp and Clement are usually accounted for on the basis of Polycarp's supposed corrections in favour of the text of one of the Synoptics. (Cf. Köster, p. 121.) However, considering the looseness of quotation in the Apostolic Fathers, it seems strange that such corrections would have been made at all.

⁴ R. Knopf remarks concerning Polycarp's maxim: "Das sieht nicht so aus, als ob es aus I Clem. entlehnt sei, obwohl Polycarp sehr stark von Clem. abhängig ist und sich vielfach, so schon in der Zuschrift, an ihn anlehnt". *Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel und die zwei Clemensbriefe*, HZNT, *Die Apostolischen Väter* I (Tübingen, 1920), 64. Cf. Grant, *AF I* (New York, 1964), 66.

than strict dependence upon Clement.¹ This, combined with the rather striking differences between the citations, has left some writers convinced that Polycarp here provides independent witness to the maxims found in Cl. 13, deriving them probably from an extra-canonical tradition whether oral or written.²

E. Massaux argues that the maxims in Polycarp are presented in the form of a quatrain, the first and third lines ending in $-\theta\eta\tau\epsilon$, the second and fourth in $-\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$. This he regards as just the kind of mnemonic device which is introduced to facilitate the handing down of oral tradition. Contending that the source of Clement's maxims is oral tradition, Massaux finds Polycarp's maxims to be evidence of the continuance of that same oral tradition, seen now at a later stage of evolution marked by a certain simplification and polish. Polycarp's maxims are thus understood by Massaux to be independent from those in Clement.³

In addition to the extended parallels found in Clement of Alexandria and Polycarp, certain of Clement's maxims are also found in later writings.⁴ The *Didascalia Apostolorum*, probably the earliest of these (i.e. from the early third century), contains three of the seven maxims: in Chapter VII (Connolly, p. 66; Funk ii, 21) the sayings on "giving" (d) and "forgiving" (b); and in Chapter X (Connolly, p. 106; Funk ii, 42) the sayings on "judging" (e). These maxims are similarly found in the fourth century compilation known as the *Apostolic Constitutions* which among other things took up the whole of the *Didascalia*. Although the latter, having been originally written in Greek, is extant in its entirety only in Syriac translation,⁵ we do possess the Greek text of the *Constitutions*, and this text may be used, with caution, as a witness to

¹ Cf. Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte: das Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die korinthische* (Leipzig, 1929), p. 109f.; and Köster, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

² Thus J. Knox writes "Of course, it is possible that Polycarp also is depending upon 1 Clement, but the presence of notable differences in the material makes it more probable that both are depending upon some unwritten account of Jesus' words". *Marcion and the New Testament* (Chicago, 1942), p. 143. See also W. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876), p. 86. [W. R. Cassels], *Supernatural Religion*⁴, I (London, 1874), 225ff.

³ Massaux, *op. cit.*, p. 168f.

⁴ The parallels are gathered by Resch under Logion 2 in his *Agrapha*¹, p. 136ff.

⁵ The Syriac text was edited by P. de Lagarde (Leipzig, 1854). The considerable Latin fragments can be found in R. H. Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum* (Oxford, 1929). The few Greek fragments were edited by J. V. Bartlet in *JTS* 18 (1916-17), 301-309.

the original Greek of the *Didascalia*.¹ Accordingly, these words are found in *Constitutions* II, 21, 5: ὁδὸς δὲ εἰρήνης ἐστὶν ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός, ὃς καὶ ἐδίδαξεν ἡμᾶς λέγων. ἄφετε, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν, δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν. The "forgiveness" maxim, except for the spelling of ἄφετε, is identical with that found in Polycarp, lacking Clement's ἵνα. The maxim on "giving" lacks Clement's ὡς ... οὕτως comparison and is given in exact agreement with Lk. 6.38a. Yet it is torn from its Lucan context and made redundant by the addition of the words: τοῦτ' ἐστίν, δίδοτε ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν τὰ παραπτώματα. In *Constitutions* II, 42, 4 one reads: ὅτι λέγει κύριος. ᾧ κρίματι κρίνετε, κριθήσεσθε, καὶ ᾧ καταδικάζετε, καταδικασθήσεσθε. The saying on "judging", while preserving the idea of comparison, differs in form from that of Clement, and except for the omission of ἐν, agrees precisely with Mt. 7.2a.² Lk. 6.37b may be cited as a parallel to the added saying on "condemning".

The remaining parallels are found in writings which stem mainly from the fourth century. Thus both in Macarius (*Hom.* 37.3) and the interpolated recension of Ignatius' *Epistle to the Trallians* (Chapter VIII), the saying on "forgiving" (b) is found in a form similar to that of Clement's, and identical with the form of the maxim as found in Polycarp: ἄφετε καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν.³ In Origen we find the maxim on judging preceded by the adverb ὡς as in Clement, but without the complementary οὕτως: ὡς κρίνετε, κριθήσεσθε.

There are, of course, other parallels to the maxims of Cl. 13 which could be gathered from the writings of the post-Nicene age. But inasmuch as they parallel material in Clement which, in fact, has its more or less exact equivalent in the Synoptic Gospels, one must allow for the more probable dependence of these parallels upon the latter. The parallels given above, on the other hand, seem to reflect the peculiarities

¹ See Connolly, *op. cit.*, p. xxv.; p. 66, note. The Greek text of the *Apostolic Constitutions* used in the following is from F. X. Funk (ed.) *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Paderbornae, 1905).

² The prohibition of "judging" is found in *Didascalia* IX (Connolly, p. 101), and in *Constitutions* II, 36: μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθήσεσθε, words which are almost in exact agreement with Lk. 6.37a.

³ For Macarius, see J. P. Migne, *PG*, vol. 34, col. 748; for Pseudo-Ignatius, see Lightfoot II, 3, 156f. Resch surprisingly fails to note the presence of the maxim in Polycarp (*op. cit.*, p. 137f.). See also Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* I (Erlangen, 1881), 137ff.

of the wording of the maxims as found in Clement in contrast with the Synoptic Gospels. The question now to be asked is, Do these parallels bear independent witness to an extra-canonical collection of Jesus' sayings?

A. Resch argued that not only these parallels, but also the passage in the two Clements, *and* the Synoptic parallels—all constitute independent witnesses to a common source,¹ a Synoptic *Grundschrift* written in Hebrew. The variants in the parallels (canonical and extra-canonical) were thus accounted for as the result of the independent translations into Greek.² Resch's case does not rest on our passage alone, but upon his collection of a total of 74 Logia ("pure" *agrapha*) and 103 Apocrypha ("doubtful and impure" *agrapha*).

J. H. Ropes, however, justly criticized Resch for failing to give due consideration to the relations between the parallels, and for reading all the evidence in the light of a pre-supposed solution to the Synoptic problem in the alleged existence of a Hebrew *Urevangelium*.³ In his fresh examination of the materials, Ropes found that of Resch's combined Logia and Apocrypha, only 47 could be rightly called "*agrapha*", that is, sayings that are truly independent from the canonical tradition and clearly ascribed to Jesus. (Of these only eleven were regarded as having historical value.) In the first part of his book, Ropes eliminated 67 of Resch's Logia and Apocrypha as not being truly *agrapha*. The majority of these were rejected because the material could be accounted for in other ways on the basis of existing parallels. It is in this category that our passage of seven maxims is placed. Calling attention to the parallels in Lk. 6.36-38, Ropes abruptly concludes that: "wir es hier nur mit einer anderen Rezension desselben Materials zu thun haben, welches wir in unseren kanonischen Evangelien besitzen".⁴ No mention at all is made of the *χρηστεύω* maxim (f) (nor,

¹ "Alle diese canonischen und aussercanonischen Parallelen erscheinen daher als Bruchstücke eines gemeinsamen Quellentextes, welcher bei Clemens Rom. und Clemens Al. am vollständigsten erhalten ist, wobei die fast wörtliche Übereinstimmung beiden Autoren für die Genauigkeit ihrer Citate Zeugniß ablegt". *Op. cit.*, p. 137.

² Resch reconstructed the Hebrew *λόγια* he believed to underlie our passage in Cl. 13, in his *Die Logia Jesu* (Leipzig, 1898), p. 25. This, he contends, is what Papias refers to in Eusebius (*HE* III, 39, 16): *Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο, ἡρμήνευσεν δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος*. For an example of Resch's reasoning back to a common source on the basis of variants, see *Agrapha*¹, p. 140.

³ *Die Sprüche Jesu*, TU 14 (Leipzig, 1896), 6.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

of course, of the maxim on "doing" [c]). Ropes does say that the passage is important for the question of an *Urevangelium*, but seems to ignore the possibility that such an *Urevangelium* (if it ever existed) could have contained sayings of Jesus not taken up into the canonical Gospels. In his second edition of *Agrapha*, Resch cited the *χρηστεύω* saying alone from the seven maxims of Clement among his *agrapha*.¹

It must be admitted that Resch was wrong in assuming that all the parallels to Clement's maxims were independent of Clement's epistle.² The parallel passages from the *Didascalia Apostolorum* as found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, as we have seen, agree exactly or very nearly so either with the sayings as found in the Gospels or as found in Polycarp. It is more reasonable to suppose dependence upon these sources for the maxims, or even upon Clement for that matter,³ than to suppose that these passages provide independent witnesses deriving from a common source. The same would seem to hold true for the parallels found in fourth century writings. Indeed, the further such parallels are removed from the first two centuries the more unlikely it becomes that an independent extra-canonical tradition is being witnessed to, and the more likely it becomes that the writers knew of and borrowed from Clement of Alexandria, Polycarp, or Clement of Rome. Thus, to sum up this evaluation of the parallels to the seven maxims of Clement, the Alexandrian Clement seems unquestionably dependent directly upon Clement of Rome; Polycarp is possibly dependent upon Clement of Rome, but by no means certainly so; and the later parallels in all probability reflect either the influence of one of these three or direct dependence upon the Synoptic Gospels.

We now turn to the various suggestions which have been made concerning the source of Clement's citation, examining them in the light of the data set forth above, and attempting to decide which explains the data most satisfactorily. Because of the difficulties involved, few of the writers mentioned below are dogmatic about their hypotheses.

To begin with, there have been scholars of the most outstanding merit who have preferred the simple hypothesis that Clement is quoting from the Synoptic Gospels, freely or from memory. Thus J. B.

¹ *Agrapha*², TU 30 (Leipzig, 1906), 88, (Agraphon 66).

² Even in his second edition, Resch appears to cite the parallel in Clement of Alexandria as reason for retaining the seven maxims in his reconstructed Logia. *Ibid*.

³ Connolly has "no difficulty in believing" that the author of the *Didascalia* knew both Polycarp and Clement. *Op. cit.*, p. LXXX.

Lightfoot calls attention to the fact that Clement's quotations from the OT are often very free (he cites the passage concerning Rahab in chapter 12), and argues that the same freedom should be allowed to Clement when he is quoting from the Gospels. He concludes: "The hypothesis therefore, that Clement derived the saying from an oral tradition or from some lost Gospel, is not needed".¹ Gebhardt and Harnack, noting the differences between Clement's citation and the Synoptic Gospels, seem in their edition to prefer quotation from memory as the explanation to an assertion that Clement is borrowing from a non-canonical source.² Both Funk and Bryennios in their editions of Clement also favour free citation from the Synoptics as the explanation of the differences.³

Of course, the possibility that Clement was here quoting from the Synoptic Gospels freely or from memory must be admitted. And, with Lightfoot, it must be agreed that there is no strict *necessity* of asserting a non-canonical source for the citation. At the same time, however, this lack of necessity (or "certainty") exists on both sides and thus in no way lessens the obligation to assess the plausibility of alternative explanations. The "simplest" explanation is not necessarily the true one, and ought not, therefore, to be accepted to the exclusion of other explanations without first conducting a full examination of the matter.

The majority of writers on the subject have found the hypothesis of an extra-canonical source a more attractive explanation of the peculiarities of Clement's citation than the assertion of direct dependence upon the Synoptics. Thus, like E. Massaux,⁴ V. H. Stanton argues for oral tradition as Clement's source, noting that "there are marks of careful construction in the passage ... which render it improbable that the words have been put together simply under the influence of the

¹ Lightfoot I, 2, 52.

² O. Gebhardt and A. Harnack, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* (Lipsiae, 1876), p. 27. Later, however, Harnack seemed to favour the possibility of an extra-canonical written source. See below. Zahn also sees the citation as dependent upon the Synoptics: "Wir sehen nur, dass er sich dabei einer grossen Freiheit bediente". *GNTK* I, 917.

³ F. X. Funk, *Patres Apostolici* I (Tübingen, 1901), 116f. Bryennios, *ΚΑΗΜΕΝΤΟΣ αἱ δύο πρὸς Κορινθίους Ἐπιστολαί* (Constantinople, 1875), p. 27.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 12f.

accidental association of memory".¹ H. Köster² and R. M. Grant³ also find that the particular, stylized form of Clement's citation argues strongly for extra-canonical tradition as its source. The latter writers, however, leave open the question whether this tradition was oral or written, although they perhaps tend to favour the former alternative. Similarly, but without the same degree of confidence, the Oxford Committee believes the citation was derived "from some written or unwritten form of 'Catechesis'".⁴ Again, O. Knoch,⁵ R. Knopf,⁶ C. C. Richardson,⁷ and E. J. Goodspeed⁸ regard it as possible that an extra-canonical collection of Jesus' sayings is being quoted, without specifying whether the collection was oral or written.

Others have clearly indicated their preference for a written extra-canonical source for Clement's citation. Here we first list Resch, already mentioned, with his hypothesis of a Hebrew *Urevangelium*.⁹ W. K. L. Clarke favours an extra-canonical source, and for unexplained reasons finds the *μὴνῆσκω* in the introductory formula irreconcilable

¹ *The Gospels as Historical Documents* I (Cambridge, 1903), p. 7. L. E. Wright similarly suggests that "an oral compendium of the gospel ethic could readily account for the variations here evident". *Alterations of the Words of Jesus as Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century*, Harvard Historical Monographs XXV (Cambridge, Mass., 1952), p. 78.

² "Die ganze Komposition ist so einheitlich und in sich straff gegliedert, dass man das Zustandekommen der vorliegenden Form 1. Clem. kaum zutrauen darf". *Op. cit.*, p. 15. K. Beyschlag cites Köster approvingly. *Clemens Romanus und der Frühkatholizismus*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 35 (Tübingen, 1966), p. 30f.

³ "The structure present in Clement's formulation suggests that he is following some source ... already composed for instruction or liturgical usage or both". *The Formation of the New Testament* (London, 1965), p. 79. See also *idem*, *AF* II, 36; I, 40. Cf. C. G. Griffinhoof, *The Unwritten Sayings of Christ* (London, 1903), p. 78.

⁴ *NTAF* (ed. Oxford Society of Historical Theology, 1905), p. 61. Cf. also Sanday, *Inspiration* (London, 1894), p. 300. Jacquier, *op. cit.*, I, 42.

⁵ *Eigenart und Bedeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufriss des ersten Clemensbriefes* (Bonn, 1964). Knoch believes that the Synoptics underlie the collection. "Wegen seiner einheitlichen Form ist der zitierte Passus deutlich sekundärer Art und zwar wohl den heutigen Evangelien des Mt. und Lk. gegenüber, die der unbekannte Verfasser benützt haben dürfte". *Ibid.*, p. 70.

⁶ *Die Apostolischen Väter*, HZNT I, 64.

⁷ *Early Christian Fathers*, LCC, I (London, 1953), 50. Cf. A. Hilgenfeld, *Clementis Romani Epistulae* (Lipsiae, 1876), p. 93.

⁸ *A History of Early Christian Literature*, rev. R. M. Grant (Chicago, 1966), p. 9f. Cf. J. Donaldson, *The Apostolical Fathers* (London, 1874), 185.

⁹ See above, p. 145.

with an oral source.¹ B. H. Streeter felt that the evidence pointed to "the existence in the Church of Rome of a discourse document to some extent parallel to the Great Sermon in Mt. and Lk." since the express introductory formula made it "difficult to believe that it is merely a free rendering of the general substance of mingled reminiscences of Mt. and Lk. combined".² W. R. Cassels, in his anonymously published book, also argued against oral tradition as the source of Clement's citation: "It seems impossible that the writer should so markedly have indicated a precise quotation of words of Jesus, and should so emphatically have commended them as the rule of life to the Corinthians, had these precepts been mere floating tradition, until then unstamped with written permanence".³ W. Sanday, in a book written in partial reply to Cassels' book, recognized the difficulty of coming to a definite conclusion concerning the source of the citation and, while not minimizing the role played by memory, wrote "at the same time I cannot but think that there has been somewhere a written version different from our Gospels to which he [Polycarp] and Clement have had access".⁴

A. Harnack investigated the possibility that the citations of Synoptic material found in Clement and Polycarp were taken directly from Q, the hypothetical written collection of sayings which seems to have been employed by Mt. and Lk. in writing their Gospels.⁵ Noting the similarity of introductory formulae in Clement's and Polycarp's citations, and Acts 20.35, Harnack felt that an extra-canonical compilation of Jesus' sayings was being cited, possibly in written form, bearing the title *Λόγοι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*. Theoretically this could have been Q, but the whole matter remains very doubtful, according to Harnack, because Polycarp is dependent on Clement; parts of the citation in Cl. 13 are without parallel in Mt. or Lk.; and most importantly, the part which does coincide with Q (the *κρίνεσθαι* maxim) is worded differently from Q as reconstructed by Harnack on the basis of Mt. and Lk.⁶

¹ " 'Remembering' suggests a source familiar to both Rome and Corinth and does not suit either a free composition of well-known sayings or an oral tradition". *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians* (London, 1937), 33.

² *The Four Gospels* (London, 1924), p. 239f.

³ *Supernatural Religion*⁴, I, 226.

⁴ *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 86. Sanday's work must be commended for its careful and balanced scholarship.

⁵ *The Sayings of Jesus*, trans. J. R. Wilkinson (London, 1908), p. 187ff.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 189f. In his monograph on Clement's epistle, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, Harnack was content simply to ask "Hat Clemens eine Sammlung von Sprüchen Jesu im Auge?" p. 110.

From this variety of suggestions as to the source of the citation in Cl. 13, it can be seen that the question is a difficult one. However, although there is no room for dogmatism here, it does seem possible to determine the most probable solution. The main question is, of course, whether or not the citation is dependent upon an extra-canonical source. If this question is answered affirmatively, the subsidiary and more difficult question arises as to whether that source was oral or written. As to the first question, it seems that Clement most probably did employ an extra-canonical source. This for the following reasons. (1) As shown above, two of the seven maxims are without material parallel in the Synoptics. It is very difficult to believe that Clement in calling for his readers to "remember the words of our Lord Jesus"—thus apparently words with which the Corinthians were expected to be very familiar—has in mind sayings found in the Synoptics when two of the sayings are expressed in words which find no parallel there. (2) Of the remaining five maxims, none agrees verbatim with any of the Synoptics, and two (a and b) are very different in form from their Synoptic parallels. Only three of the maxims (d, e, and g) look as though they could have come from the Synoptic Gospels. (3) The maxims as found in Clement are presented in a peculiar, stylized form which seems to give them their own identity, independent from the sayings as found in the Synoptic Gospels. The imperatives followed by *iva* clauses in the first two maxims, and the *ὡς ... οὕτως* comparisons of the next four maxims tie the maxims together and afford them a unity and cumulative forcefulness which they lack in the Synoptics. The introductory formula suggests that the Corinthians would already have been familiar with them in this form. (4) Because of the considerable differences between Clement's citation and the fragment of the citation found in Polycarp, the possibility exists that Polycarp here provides independent witness to Clement's source. In view of Polycarp's intimate knowledge of Clement's epistle,¹ it is difficult to account for the differences in the citation if he borrowed it from Clement. On the other hand, Massaux's hypothesis is intriguing,² and even if

¹ Polycarp is said by Streeter to have known Clement's epistle "by heart". *The Four Gospels*, p. 528. Cf. Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 286. Harrison explains the differences between the citation in Clement and Polycarp as the result of Polycarp's harmonization of the sayings in favour of Mt. or Lk., and the omission of material with no Gospel equivalent. But this does not account for Polycarp's omission of the maxim on "giving" (d). See above, p. 142, n. 3.

² See above, p. 143.

it be not accepted completely, the differences between the two citations may well be accounted for by changes occurring in the process of oral tradition. This fourth point, however, is only conjectural, and is not vital to the argument which rests on the first three points.

Thus we regard it as highly probable that Clement here employs an extra-canonical tradition which was known also to his Corinthian readers. Assuming that this is the case, was that tradition oral or written? Here we have even less to go on than in the former question. Nonetheless, for the following reasons, the oral tradition hypothesis seems easier and more likely to be true than the written tradition hypothesis. (1) The form of the citation is eminently suitable for material designed to be handed down by memory. The sayings are brief and pointed, and together are characterized by patterns of repetition (imperative with *ἵνα*, *ὥς* ... *οὕτως*) which would greatly facilitate memorization. (2) The use of the verb *μυμνήσκω* in the introductory formula seems especially appropriate in referring to memorized words handed down orally. Similarly, in Acts 20.35 the cognate verb *μνημονεύω* is used to introduce a saying of Jesus not recorded in the Gospels, but presumably handed down orally. (3) There has been, in recent years, a new appreciation for the importance of oral tradition in the early Church.¹ The early Christians apparently made great use of material handed down orally, especially in the teaching given to catechumens in preparation for baptism. Since oral tradition was thus employed, it is easier to account for extra-canonical sayings of Jesus as being handed down orally than it is to suppose these were found in documents which had wide circulation in the early Church, but which are nowhere referred to, and are no longer extant.² (4) Lastly, as has already been noted, the variations between the citation as found in Clement and Polycarp are more easily explainable as variations in the development of oral tradition than as due to Polycarp's poor attempt at recalling Clement's citation.

Thus for the citation of Synoptic-type material found in Cl. 13, on the basis of the preceding discussion, it seems that Clement is here dependent upon an oral extra-canonical tradition for his source.

¹ See especially H. Riesenfeld, *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings*, TU 73 (Berlin, 1959), 43-65. B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript* (Uppsala, 1961).

² See below, pp. 303-311.

CLEMENT 46.8
(Text of A, unless
otherwise indicated)

SYNOPTIC GOSPELS
(Text of Nestle-Aland)

	<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>
οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ ¹	26.24b οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται . καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγενήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος. 18.6 ὅς δ' ἂν σκαυδαλίῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ, συμφέροι αὐτῷ ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὀνικὸς περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ καταποντισθῇ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης.	14.21b οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται . καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγενήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος. 9.42 καὶ ὅς ἂν σκαυδαλίῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων, καλὸν ἐστὶν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περὶκειται μύλος ὀνικὸς περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.	22.22b πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ παραδίδοται.
καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ ² εἰ οὐκ ἐγενήθη ³			
ἡ ἓνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκαυδαλίαι			
κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτῷ περιτεθῆναι μύλον ⁴			17.2 λυσitelεί αὐτῷ εἰ λίθος μωλικὸς περὶκειται περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσθεται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν
καὶ καταποντισθῆναι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν,			
(Text of L, S, K', and Clement of Alexandria) ⁵			
ἡ ἓνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διατρέψαι.			ἡ ἓνα σκαυδαλίῃ τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἓνα.

(Notes found on following page.)

2. *Clement 46.8* (see accompanying synopsis on preceding page)

The second lengthy quotation of material from the synoptic tradition found in Clement's epistle again consists of sayings of Jesus, but not of the epigrammatic type found in chapter 13. Here we have a combination of two longer sayings each of which is found in a different context in the Synoptic Gospels. The divisive tendencies of the Corinthian Church were seen by Clement to be a stumbling-block to many, causing them to turn away from the faith. He recalls, and quotes to the Corinthians, words which Jesus spoke concerning those who cause others to stumble. The first part of the citation, however, seems to consist of words from Mt. 26 and Mk. 14 which are addressed to Judas by Jesus with particular reference to Judas' imminent betrayal of Jesus. In Clement's citation these words are combined with words similar to the more general warning against those who offend found in the Synoptics. The two sayings are made to overlap by the addition to the first of the generalizing words *ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι*, words which are actually more appropriate to the second saying, from whence they may originally have been borrowed, *ἐκλεκτῶν* being substituted for *μικρῶν*.

The accompanying synopsis reveals that except for the final words *ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι*, the first of Clement's two sayings is closely paralleled both in Mt. and Mk. Clement's citation, however, omits the specifying clause *δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται*, found in Mt. and Mk., as well as the redundant words *ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος*, following *ἐγεννήθη*. Apart from these differences, and the insignificant omission of the connective *δέ*, Clement's citation agrees exactly with Mt., and very nearly so with Mk., who has the shorter *καλὸν αὐτῷ*, omitting the copula *ἦν*.¹ Thus if Clement is quoting

¹ The textual witness for the inclusion of *ἦν* in Mk. is weighty, but the reading which omits *ἦν* is the more difficult and is thus regarded as the more primitive. See Nestle-Aland, *in loc.*

Notes to synopsis on preceding page:

¹ K¹ adds "through whom the stumbling-block comes".

² Latin lacks the equivalent of *αὐτῷ*.

³ C, reads *εἰ μή*.

⁴ Latin adds *collo eius*, in agreement with the three Synoptics; K¹ adds "around his neck".

⁵ A and C read : *ἢ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι*. For justification of text in synopsis, see p. 154f.

from Mt., he has omitted a clause (thereby removing the saying from its contextual setting), omitted some redundant words, and added a clause to complete the meaning of the sentence favouring his own purposes.

Clement's second saying finds parallels in the Synoptic Gospels, but the agreement is not as close as it is in the first saying. Clement's citation lacks the opening words of Mt. 18.6 and Mk. 9.42, the referent being clear from the concluding words of the preceding saying. Clement's *κρεῖττον ἢν αὐτῷ* agrees with none of the Synoptics despite the fact that in the latter are found three different wordings.¹ Clement's citation has *περιτεθῆναι* for Mt.'s *κρεμασθῆ* and Mk. and Lk.'s *περίκειται*. In contrast to the Synoptics Clement has the simple *μύλον*, unqualified. Moreover, Clement's citation omits the phrase *περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ*, common to all three Synoptics. The verb *καταποντισθῆναι* is found only in Mt., but there in the indicative rather than as an infinitive. Clement's phrase *εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν* is found in Mk. and Lk., Mt.'s reading differing considerably. The final clause of Clement's citation finds its equivalent only in Lk. The parallel is striking if the reading of A and C be accepted: *ἢ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι*. However, the wording of the parallel is not very close if, as seems most probable, the reading found in the early versions² and preserved in Clement of Alexandria is to be preferred: *ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέψαι*. Lightfoot declared himself convinced that the reading of the Syriac translation of Clement's epistle was at this point superior to both of the Greek MSS, A and C, for the following reasons: (1) *ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέψαι* is the more difficult reading, in that it differs the most from the reading of the Synoptics and thus is the more likely of the two to have been changed; (2) Clement of Alexandria's quotation of the Roman Clement indicates that he found this reading in his MS; and (3) immediately after his citation, Clement of Rome continues with the words *τὸ σχίσμα ὑμῶν πολλοὺς δέστρεψεν*, thus picking up the final verb of the citation, a practice

¹ The Lucan text has at two points apparently been harmonized with Mt. Thus the Western text reads *συμφέρει* for *λυσιτελεῖ*, and the Received Text reads *μύλος ὀνικός* for *λίθος μυλικός*. In W the latter is partially harmonized: *λίθος ὀνικός*.

² L reads "quam unum de electis meis perverteret" (S and K¹, the equivalent); see also P. M. Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

very common in Clement's epistle.¹ The reading of A and C may easily be explained as the result of tampering designed to harmonize Clement's reading with that of Lk.

Some writers, however, are of the opinion that the διαστρέφαι is in fact caused by, rather than the cause of, the following διέστρεψεν. Thus O. Stählin, while apparently regarding ἡ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι as the original reading of the citation in Clement of Rome, sees the alternate reading found in Clement of Alexandria as the result of the following διέστρεψεν.² Whereas Stählin gives us no hint as to who was responsible for the change of σκανδαλίσαι to διαστρέφαι, others suggest that Clement himself, finding σκανδαλίσαι in his sources, made the change. Thus Köster considers ἡ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέφαι to be the original reading of the Roman Clement's epistle, but in the light of the following διέστρεψεν argues that Clement altered the σκανδαλίσαι of his source to fit the context he had constructed for it.³ Massaux too holds that Clement has deliberately altered σκανδαλίσαι to διαστρέφαι.⁴ However, without tangible evidence to the contrary, Lightfoot's argument is not so easily reversed. Had the source of Clement's citation originally ended with the word σκανδαλίσαι, there is no reason why he could not have kept the word and continued in his remarks with the words τὸ σχίσμα ὑμῶν πολλοὺς ἐσκανδαλίσεν. Clement's habit is to take up in his own remarks a leading word of a citation, not vice versa. Furthermore, the hypotheses of Stählin and Köster leave completely unex-

¹ Lightfoot I, 2, 141. Lightfoot's argument is strengthened by the concurring witness of the Latin and Coptic versions which came to light after his death. For a full list of examples of Clement's penchant for taking key words from his citations, see *ibid.*, p. 142.

² Thus Stählin says of the reading found in Clement of Alexandria, ἡ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέφαι, "wohl veranlasst durch 1. Clem. ad Cor. 46.9 τὸ σχίσμα ὑμῶν πολλοὺς διέστρεψεν". Yet the text of the Roman Clement is said to be μικρῶν—σκανδαλίσαι. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, GCSE II (Berlin, 1960), 245. It is doubtful that Clement of Alexandria is to be held responsible for the change of σκανδαλίσαι to διαστρέφαι since he does not continue with the Roman Clement's following comment, τὸ σχίσμα ὑμῶν πολλοὺς διέστρεψεν κτλ.

³ "Ich bin allerdings der Meinung, dass 1 Clem. διαστρέφαι noch nicht in seiner Vorlage gelesen hat, sondern dem Kontext entsprechend für ein ursprüngliches σκανδαλίσαι einsetzte". *Op. cit.*, p. 17, n. 1.

⁴ "Obéissant à sa façon habituelle de procéder, Clément a donc pu remplacer σκανδαλίσαι [the reading of Mt., upon which Massaux believes Clement to be dependent] par διαστρέφαι; il modifie légèrement son text en prévision du développement qui va suivre". Massaux, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

plained the change of *μικρῶν* to *ἐκλεκτῶν* inasmuch as the words are in no way affected by the changing of the verbs, nor are they connected in any special way with the words immediately following the citation.

Of these two sayings in Clement's citation, then, the first may be regarded as closely paralleled in the Synoptics; the second, in wording, fairly remote from the Synoptic parallels. In addition to the Synoptic parallels, the citation appears verbatim in Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* III, 107, 2. As argued above, it seems probable that the Alexandrian's reading *ἡ ἓνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέψαι* reflects the Roman Clement's original, against the reading of A and C. The only other variant is the Alexandrian's *εἰ μὴ ἐγεννήθη* (agreeing with C), against *εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη* in Codex A of Clement's epistle. As with the citation in chapter 13, there can be no question but that Clement of Alexandria is here also dependent upon Clement of Rome, and does not provide an independent witness to the citation as found in the latter.¹

In the extant literature of the early Church there are few close parallels to the sayings of Clement's citation, and fewer parallels which conflate these two sayings. Among the Apostolic Fathers the only parallel to be found is in the *Shepherd* of Hermas, *Vis.* IV, 2, 6, where the Church, personified by a maiden, exhorts Hermas to teach repentance and faith that the elect of the Lord might escape his wrath, adding the words of warning: *οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀκούσασιν τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα καὶ παρακούσασιν · αἰρετώτερον ἦν αὐτοῖς τὸ μὴ γεννηθῆναι.*² These words are not presented as a formal citation of the words of Jesus, as in Clement, but are more allusive in nature differing markedly from the words as found in the Synoptic Gospels. Yet they indicate the fact that words which in the Gospels are applied only to Judas, were in the early Church applied much more broadly. In Hermas they refer to the disobedient; in Clement to those who cause others to stumble. While we can see a similarity to Clement's citation in the adaptation and reapplication of this saying of Jesus, it seems unlikely that Hermas provides an independent witness to an extra-canonical source which Clement may have used. The most that may be said is

¹ For the argument of the Alexandrian Clement's dependence upon Clement of Rome, see above, p. 140.

² For text, see M. Whittaker, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, GCSE I, Der Hirt des Hermas (Berlin, 1956), 21.

that Hermas witnesses to the wider application of this saying in the early Church.¹

Perhaps the most interesting and significant parallel, witnessing to the text of Marcion's Gospel,² is found in Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* IV, 35 :

Conuersus ibidem ad discipulos 'uae' dicit auctori scandalorum : expedisse ei, si natus non fuisset aut si molino saxo ad collum deligato praecipitatus esset in profundam, quam unum ex illis modicis utique discipulis eius scandalizasset.³

Here we have the same conflation of sayings as in Clement's citation, as can be seen from the words, *expedisse ei, si natus non fuisset*—words which in the Gospels are reserved for Judas. The generalized application is made more easily in Tertullian, however, in that the "woe" saying is pronounced upon *auctori scandalorum*, rather than τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ as in the Gospels and Clement. Indeed, this "woe" saying is much more like that of Mt. 18.7 and Lk. 17.1 (both pronounced upon the one through whom scandal comes) than the "woe" saying of the Judas passage. In Tertullian the whole citation has a much more unified appearance, the combination of passages being further obscured by the omission of unnecessary duplication. Thus the conclusion of the Judas passage is omitted (i.e. ἡ εἷνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι), as is the beginning of the second passage (κρεῖττον ἢν αὐτῷ), and the two passages are then combined by the simple *aut.* The *expedisse ei* thus serves both passages as does the conclusion *quam unum* etc. In the latter, Tertullian agrees with the ending of Lk. 17.2 against the preferred reading of Clement's citation. The important fact, however, is that both in Clement and in Marcion, as witnessed by Tertullian, we have the same combination of passages. Words which originally applied to Judas are taken by both and applied in the same way to persons who cause scandal. Yet because of the differences between the two citations, we cannot regard Marcion as an independent witness to Clement's source. It is most probable that Marcion is here dependent upon Lk. 17.1-2, a passage into which he has inserted the words spoken

¹ The asseveration that it were good for a person not to have been born is found in the pre-Christian Ethiopian Book of Enoch (38.2) where it is broadly applied to "sinners ... who have denied the Lord of Spirits". See R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1893), p. 112.

² Harnack gives the underlying Greek in his reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel. *Marcion : Das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott* (Leipzig, 1921), p. 204.

³ For text, see A. Kroymann (ed.), *Tertulliani Opera*, CSEL III (Lipsiae, 1906), 538.

by Jesus to Judas. This insertion may have been unconscious on Marcion's own part, or it may have been suggested to him by Clement's epistle, with which he was probably acquainted.¹ Most probably, however, the broader application of the Judas saying and even the conjunction of these particular passages had already become common in the early Christian community.

The same conflation of sayings is also found in the Dialogue of Adamantius, *De Recta In Deum Fide*, Section I: αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπεφώνητο λέγων · οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται · συμφέρεи αὐτῷ, εἰ μὴ ἐγεννήθῃ · ἢ γεννηθέντα μύλῳ ὀνικῷ προστεθῆναι καὶ καταποντισθῆναι ἐν τῷ βάθει τῆς θαλάσσης.² The first part of this citation (i.e. up to and including ἐγεννήθῃ) is a very close parallel to Mt. 26.24b and Mk. 14.21b. The only important differences are the omission of ἐκείνῳ, and the substitution of συμφέρεи αὐτῷ for καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ. The words συμφέρεи αὐτῷ, however, are found in our second saying, Mt. 18.6, and it is with this saying that Adamantius continues. A bridge between the two sayings is made with the words ἢ γεννηθέντα; the words συμφέρεи αὐτῷ are not repeated, and the saying continues, paralleling Mt. more closely than Mk. or Lk. The twice repeated clause of Clement's citation, ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι/διαστρέψαι is lacking in Adamantius.

Because in the Gospels, as we have seen, the sayings here conflated occur in different contexts, the first being addressed specifically to Judas, and the second being presented as a general warning to the disciples, to conflate the two is to do violence to the context of the one or the other. It is just here that the citations of Clement and Adamantius differ. For while Clement's citation ignores the context of the first saying (as does that of Marcion), applying the words to all who cause stumbling, the citation of Adamantius ignores the context of the second saying, applying the words specifically to Judas, as can be seen from the words immediately preceding the citation: καθὼς ἐκολάσθη εἰς κύριον ἀσεβήσας Ἰούδας. Again, it is possible that Adamantius combined the sayings independently, or knew of the combination of these sayings found in the writings of the Roman and/or Alexandrian Clement. However, it is equally possible, as suggested

¹ See Lightfoot I, 1, 160 for Tertullian's knowledge of Clement's epistle.

² For text, see W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, *Adamantius*, GCS (Leipzig, 1901). The Dialogue probably from the beginning of the fourth century, has been attributed to Origen, and is sometimes included among the works of Origen.

above, that sayings so similar in content were already commonly cited in combination. In the latter case, Adamantius probably transferred the application from the general (those who cause scandal) to the specific (Judas). Judas as the betrayer of Jesus may well have been regarded as the archetype of those who cause scandal. Adamantius' citation is thus also too dissimilar from that of Clement to allow it as an independent witness to Clement's source.

Lastly, in the *Apostolic Constitutions* V, 14, 4 (but lacking in the *Didascalia*), the first of the two sayings is found in almost verbatim agreement with Mt. and Mk. : οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ, δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται · καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη. Here, however, we have unquestionable dependence upon the Synoptic Gospels. Similarly, other parallels to this saying in the literature of the third and fourth century (e.g. Origen, *Commentary on Matthew* [18.7]; Ephraem of Syria, *Explanatio Evangelii Concordantis* XIX, 1) do not witness to any of the peculiarities of Clement's citation, but agree so closely with the Synoptics that one need not look elsewhere for their source.¹

To sum up then, with the exception of the citation found in Clement of Alexandria—which is certainly dependent on the Roman Clement—none of the parallels found in the literature of the first few centuries agrees closely enough with Clement's citation to be considered an independent witness to his source. They all are most probably derived from the Synoptic Gospels themselves. Yet they do provide evidence that in the catechetical and homiletical tradition of the early Church the words originally addressed to Judas soon received wider application and were commonly combined with similar words of warning found in the Gospels.

But what can be said about Clement's citation itself? Was it derived from the Synoptics or from an extra-canonical source? Most writers have felt constrained to make the same judgement on both of Clement's

¹ A woe saying found in the pseudonymous *Clementine Homilies* (XII, 29, 1) provides an interesting parallel to the context of our citation : καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας προφήτης ἔφη · τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐλθεῖν δεῖ, μακάριος δὲ (φησὶν) δι' οὗ ἔρχεται · ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ κακὰ ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν, οὐαὶ δὲ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται. The last part of this citation is very close to Mt. 18.7 : οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων· ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δι' οὗ τὸ σκάνδαλον ἔρχεται, and Lk. 17.1b ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἐλθεῖν, οὐαὶ δὲ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται. The important difference, however, is the substitution of the more general τὰ κακά for τὰ σκάνδαλα.

citations and thus they express opinions here similar to those expressed concerning the citation in Cl. 13. Some exceptions may be noted. Surprisingly, Massaux, who, as we have seen, argues strongly for oral tradition as the source of the first citation, here alleges Clement's literary dependence upon Mt., writing that "Semblable conclusion nous à croire que Clement a combiné deux passages de Mt".¹ On the other hand, Gebhardt and Harnack who had express reserve concerning an extra-canonical source for the first citation, here cite Tischendorf approvingly when the latter attributes the citation to oral tradition.²

Among those who find the citation dependent on the Synoptic Gospels are Lardner,³ Funk,⁴ Knoch,⁵ Zahn⁶ and Lightfoot.⁷ The last two writers mentioned, however, are far from being dogmatic. Lightfoot allows the possibility of dependence upon oral tradition and (more remotely) the possibility of dependence upon an extra-canonical written source such as the Gospel of the Hebrews. Nevertheless he finds no difficulty in believing that Clement is quoting the Synoptic Gospels since Clement frequently combines divergent OT passages, and frequently cites them in a similarly free manner.

The majority of writers, however, again prefer to find Clement's source in an extra-canonical tradition. Only Resch⁸ and Cassels,⁹ for

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 26. Massaux continues by pointing out examples of Clement's combination of different OT texts. Stanton also opts for oral tradition for the first passage, but dependence upon Mt. and memory for the second. *Op. cit.*, p. 13. So also E. Jacquier, *op. cit.*, I, 43.

² Tischendorf's words, cited by Gebhardt and Harnack, are: "Diese Worte werden ausdrücklich als Worte 'Jesu unseres Herrn' angeführt; aber sie verrathen weit mehr die mündliche apostolische Überlieferung als einen Gebrauch von den vergleichbaren Stellen bei Matth. u. Lucas". *Op. cit.*, p. 77. The same words are quoted by Cassels, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

³ *The Credibility of the Gospel History*, II (London, 1847), 165. Cf. also J. B. Cotelier and P. Coustant in J. P. Migne, *PG*, vol. I, col. 304f.

⁴ *Patres Apostolici*, p. 159f.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 72. Knoch sees both Mt. and Lk. underlying the passage "denn die Änderungen lassen sich leicht als paränetische Umformung dieser beiden Vorlagen bei freier Zitation aus dem Gedächtnis verstehen".

⁶ *GNTK*, I, 918f.

⁷ Lightfoot I, 2, 141.

⁸ Resch does not discuss this citation of Clement, but it may be inferred from his listing of Clement's *κρείττον ἦν* as a translational variant of the Hebrew word *טוב* that he would see a Hebrew *Urevangelium* underlying the citation. *Agrapha*¹, p. 64.

⁹ Cassels overstates his case somewhat: "The slightest comparison of the passage with our Gospels is sufficient to convince any unprejudiced mind that it is neither a combination of texts, nor a quotation from memory". *Op. cit.*, p. 228.

their own peculiar reasons, are adamant in their insistence that the source be a written one. Grant asserts that the passage "is certainly not based directly on our written Gospels",¹ but while he seems to have opted for oral tradition as the source of the first of Clement's citations,² he has more recently argued that Clement made use of and quoted from a "gospel-like book".³ Most writers who regard Clement's source as extra-canonical prefer to find it in oral tradition. Sanday admits that taken by itself the citation is most easily explained as the result of quotation of the Synoptic Gospels by memory. Yet because the citation in Cl. 13 is most probably derived from oral tradition, he is inclined to make a similar judgement concerning this citation.⁴ Similarly, others such as Donaldson,⁵ the Oxford Committee,⁶ Clarke,⁷ Knopf,⁸ Richardson,⁹ and Goodspeed,¹⁰ while allowing the possibility of dependence upon the Synoptics, favour an extra-canonical source and tend to lean towards oral tradition as the source of Clement's citation.

Both Harnack and Köster have discussed the possible relationship of the passage to Q. Harnack notes that it is possible that the combination of sayings found in Clement's citation existed in a very similar form in Q, and that Mt. and Lk. may have followed Mk. for the most part, reproducing from Q only the more general saying concerning offences. However, the possibility is considered remote by Harnack since it seems peculiar that Mt. and Lk. should employ Q and Mk. in the same way and yet differ from one another in the resulting order (cf. Lk. 17.1,2 with Mt. 18.6,7). Moreover, Clement's citation is so tautologous as to make it appear that it is derived from two separate sources, and the *ἐκείνω* of the first saying indicates that it is taken from

¹ *AF* II, 77.

² *AF* I, 40.

³ He writes further: "From Clement, then, we seem to see that at Rome in his time there was a book of the teaching of Jesus, perhaps including an account of his sufferings (death, and therefore resurrection). This book was obviously much like our gospels, especially Mt. and Lk., but cannot be precisely identified with them". *The Formation of the New Testament*, p. 80f.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 67.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 186.

⁶ *NTAF*, p. 62.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 122.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 50.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 9f.

a source which tells a tale, and which therefore cannot be Q.¹ Köster points out the similarities between Q and Clement, and argues that Clement's citation is connected with a preliminary stage of the Gospels which could possibly have been Q. Yet because of the differences he declines to identify Clement's source as Q, and finds it more probable that the citation illustrates the type of combination of sayings by analogy that occurs in the early Christian community and becomes a part of the tradition whether oral or written.²

As with the citation of Cl. 13, the variety of suggestions which has been offered concerning Clement's source for this citation underlines the difficulty of the question. If our conclusions concerning the earlier citation were set forth with little certainty, those about to be set forth now must be regarded as even more tentative. At best we are dealing with shadings of possibility which in some instances we may venture to designate probability.

With full recognition of the possibility that the citation may well be one made from memory and thus dependent upon the Synoptic Gospels,³ and while acknowledging that the argument is not as strong as that made concerning the earlier citation, it nonetheless seems likely that Clement is here dependent upon an extra-canonical tradition. The reasons for this conclusion are the following: (1) The citation consists of a combination of two sayings found in different contexts in the Synoptics. If Clement is quoting the Synoptics from memory, it is difficult to believe that he could have forgotten that the striking words of the first saying were spoken to Judas, especially in the light of the words τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκεῖνῳ. However, rather than believe that Clement knew that the words referred to Judas and yet purposefully removed them from their context by combining them with the second saying, it seems preferable to believe that the combination presented itself to Clement through extra-canonical tradition. The purpose of such a combination of texts would suit well the *Sitz im Leben* of the

¹ *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 190f. Elsewhere Harnack concluded only that "Wahrscheinlich sind nicht unsre Evangelien zitiert, sondern eine andere Quelle". *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 117. The inclusion of ἐκεῖνῳ in Clement's citation may well be a small indication in favour of Grant's suggestion that Clement was quoting from a gospel-book which included a passion narrative. See the quotation above, p. 161, n. 3.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 19. Cf. Beyschlag who like Köster sees the citation as "Überlieferungsstoff". *Op. cit.*, p. 32.

³ It must be admitted that phenomena very similar to those in our citation are often found in citations made from memory.

first century Church and it is easily understandable how it could become a part of the catechetical instruction handed on to new converts.¹ (2) However, apart from the combination, there exist within each of the sayings differences from the Synoptic parallels. Thus, for example, there is no parallel to the words of Clement's first saying ἡ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι, nor to the parallel clause of the second saying, ἡ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου διαστρέψαι.² Among other differences which have already been indicated, κρεῖττον and περιτεθῆναι in the second saying differ from their equivalents in the Synoptics. (3) The parallelism of the two sayings exhibited in the final clauses suggests that the combination has an identity of its own apart from the Synoptic Gospels. That this citation is not a free rendering of the Synoptics on Clement's part would seem to be indicated by the introductory formula μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ · εἶπεν γάρ. Thus presumably the words which Clement cites are regarded by him as being well known to the Corinthians. The introductory formula seems to designate more than simply the general content of Jesus' teaching; it appears to refer to the words themselves, in a form already available to the Corinthians.

Although these arguments do not establish beyond doubt the thesis that Clement is here dependent upon an extra-canonical tradition, in themselves they must be recognized as valid possibilities. However, in light of the more certain conclusion that Clement has made use of an extra-canonical source of Jesus' sayings in chapter 13, the arguments presented above pass from possibilities to probabilities. The content of the citations, as well as the introductory formulae, witnesses to the probability that both citations have been derived from the same source.

Similarly, the same arguments (but with an equal degree of uncertainty) which were set forth in favour of finding the extra-canonical source of the earlier citation in an oral rather than written source

¹ OT passages were often conflated in manuals of *Testimonia* designed for the use of the community. (See p. 93ff). We may have a similar phenomenon in the conflation of Gospel passages designed for catechetical purposes.

² Wright has contended that Clement deliberately substituted ἐκλεκτῶν for μικρῶν for dogmatic reasons, namely "to vindicate the sacred and divinely ordered office of the bishops and of the other spiritually selected officials". *Alterations of the Words of Jesus*, p. 59. It is much more probable, however, that the ἐκλεκτῶν is derived by analogy from the first saying, and that Clement received the sayings already in this form via oral tradition.

hold true here. (1) Interestingly, the present citation also exhibits a form which lends itself to easy memorization. Thus in addition to the parallelism of the final clauses of both sayings, each saying itself is presented tersely, omitting the irrelevant and redundant words of the Synoptics, and thus providing catechetical material better designed for oral transmission. (2) The verb *μιμνήσκω*, as argued above, is more suitable, and is elsewhere employed, in referring to oral tradition. (3) Again, the importance of oral tradition in the early Church underlines the probability that it provided the source of Clement's citation.

We conclude then that here, as with the citation in chapter 13, Clement is dependent upon an extra-canonical, oral source for his citation of the words of Jesus.

B. ALLUSIONS TO THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION

In addition to the plain citations which have just been examined, one finds in Clement's epistle material which is common to the Synoptic Gospels, but which is not presented in citation form—introductory formulae are totally lacking—and which may therefore be considered under the category of allusions.

Perhaps the most striking of these is found in the reference to the sower in 24.5 :

ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἕκαστον τῶν σπερμάτων, ἅτινα πεσόντα εἰς τὴν γῆν ξηρά καὶ γυμνὰ διαλύεται · εἰτ' ἐκ τῆς διαλύσεως ἡ μεγαλειότης τῆς προνοίας τοῦ δεσπότου ἀνίστηται αὐτά, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς πλείονα αὖξει καὶ ἐκφέρει καρπόν.

The introductory words *ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων* are found verbatim in the Synoptic parallels (Mk. 4.3 ; Mt. 13.3 ; Lk. 8.5), and in what follows, certain words of Clement recall the Synoptic parable. Thus Clement's *ἅτινα πεσόντα* recalls Mt.'s *ὁ μὲν ἔπεσεν*; Clement's *ξηρά*, the Synoptic verb *ἐξηράνθη*; and Clement's *πλείονα αὖξει καὶ ἐκφέρει καρπόν*, especially Mk.'s *καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξανόμενα καὶ ἔφερον κτλ.* However, despite the agreement of the introductory words and the remaining similarities, what Clement presents is not the Parable of the Sower, but rather a homily on 1 Cor. 15.36ff., employing the imagery of the Parable of the Sower. Most commentators allow that Clement is here alluding to the Synoptic Gospels,¹

¹ Lightfoot (I, 2, 83) and Grant (*AF* II, 50) unhesitatingly aver that Clement here borrows from, or alludes to, the Synoptic Gospels. Massaux (*op. cit.*, p. 31f), less con-

but Köster is of the opinion that Clement has borrowed the idea of the passage from an extra-canonical source.¹ However, apart from the basic point of the passage, which Clement seems to have derived from 1 Cor. 15, it seems almost certain, especially in the introductory words, that it is the Synoptic Parable of the Sower that is being alluded to.² At the same time, because the parallels are general in character (i.e. here agreeing with Mt., and there with Mk.), as opposed to specific agreement with one particular Synoptic Gospel, it must be admitted that possibly we are confronted not with literary dependence, but with dependence upon the parable as handed down by oral tradition.

A further possible allusion to the Synoptic tradition, but less certainly so, is the parable of growth and fulfilment found in 23.4 :

ὦ ἀνόητοι, συμβάλετε ἑαυτοὺς ξύλων · λάβετε ἄμπελον πρῶτον μὲν φυλλοροεῖ, εἶτα βλαστὸς γίνεται, εἶτα φύλλον, εἶτα ἄνθος, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὄμφαξ, εἶτα σταφυλὴ παρεστηκυῖα. ὁρᾶτε ὅτι ἐν καιρῷ ὀλίγῳ εἰς πέπειρον καταντᾷ ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ ξύλου.

There is some similarity between these words which describe the inevitability of the accomplishment of God's will, especially in the fulfilment of his promises, and the parable of the inevitable growth of the Kingdom of God found in Mk. 4.26-29. However, in Mk. the metaphor is the growth of grain-bearing grasses beginning with the sowing of the seed, while in Clement it is the grape vine beginning with the shedding of leaves. Mk.'s terminology is accordingly different : the seed sprouts, and then comes πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶπεν στάχυν, εἶπεν πλήρης σῖτος ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ. Thus it is only the idea of growth which is similar to both. The same may be said concerning the parable of the budding fig tree (Mk. 13.28f. ; Mt. 24.32f. ; Lk. alone adds καὶ πάντα τὰ δένδρα, 21.29f.) which speaks of the coming consummation of God's program. Actual verbal parallels to Clement in all these Synoptic parallel passages are very slight, and may be discounted in the light of evidence that the metaphor was a common one in the ancient world.³ Most

fidently. Resch's connection of the passage with Mk. 4.26 seems unlikely. *Die Logia Jesu*, p. 39.

¹ Thus he writes : "1. Clem. hat diese Gleichnis auch kaum selbst gebildet, sondern wie das c. 23,4 angeführte Gleichnis und die Beispielerzählung vom Vogel Phönix aus der Tradition übernommen". Köster, *op. cit.*, p. 20f. See H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, III (Munich, 1926), 475.

² For the relation of the passage to 1 Cor. 15, see below, p. 201.

³ See, for example, Epictetus, *Discourses* I, 14,3 ; I, 15, 7 (cited by Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 86) ; III, 24, 86 ; III, 24, 91 ; and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, 11, 35 (cited by Lightfoot I, 2, 81).

important of all, however, is the fact that the words of Clement quoted above are part of a larger citation which, though not found in the canonical Scriptures, is introduced as *ἡ γραφή*.¹ This seems unquestionably to indicate that we are here not confronted with an allusion to the Synoptic Gospels, but rather with direct dependence upon some other source.²

A possible allusion to Mt. 5.18 (cf. Lk. 16.17) or more remotely Mt. 24.35 (Mk. 13.31; Lk. 21.33), may be found in Clement's words in 27.5: *ὅτε θέλει καὶ ὡς θέλει ποιήσει πάντα, καὶ οὐδὲν μὴ παρέλθῃ τῶν δεδογματισμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*. Massaux has argued that Clement is dependent upon Mt. 5.18 for the last clause. In his view, Clement has taken over Mt.'s *παρέλθῃ*; the *δεδογματισμένων* is the equivalent of *νόμος*; and *οὐδὲν* has been substituted for the Semitic expression *ἰῶτα ἐν ἡ μίᾳ κεραία*.³ Köster, however, has justly pointed out that this saying was current in the first century and may be dependent upon Jewish tradition rather than Mt.⁴ Despite the fact that the words *τῶν δεδογματισμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ* are also found earlier in Clement's epistle (20.4), possibly confirming the use of a non-canonical tradition in the present passage (thus Köster), it cannot positively be denied that Clement may be alluding to Synoptic tradition or the Gospel of Matthew.

Massaux finds an allusion to Mt. 7.21 (cf. Lk. 6.46) in the final clause of 30.3 :

κολληθῶμεν οὖν ἐκείνοις, οἷς ἡ χάρις ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δέδοται · ἐνδυσάμεθα τὴν δμόνοιαν ταπεινοφρονοῦντες, ἐγκρατεῦόμενοι, ἀπὸ παντὸς ψιθυρισμοῦ καὶ καταλαλιᾶς πόρρω ἑαυτοὺς ποιοῦντες, ἔργοις δικαιοῦμενοι καὶ μὴ λόγοις.

Massaux points out that the same antithesis is found in Mt. 7.21 where it is expressed in the terms *ὁ λέγων* and *ὁ ποιῶν*.⁵ However, while the import of the Matthean passage is the same, there are some important differences from Clement's text. Mt. lacks the two very important words *ἔργον* and *δικαιόω*. For the former, the equivalent

¹ This larger citation, introduced as *ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος*, appears in 2 Cl. 11.2f. There, however, in addition to certain variants it has a further sentence not found in the genuine epistle.

² Thus the majority of commentators, including Lightfoot. For further discussion of this citation, see above, p. 87f.

³ Massaux, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

⁴ "So handelt es sich um die Wiedergabe eines schon im Judentum geltenden Grundsatzes, der zwar auch Mt. 5.18 auftaucht, aber von I Clem. selbständig formuliert sein dürfte". *Op. cit.*, p. 20.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 15ff.

words are τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; for the latter, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. But both of these terms are found in Jas. 2.14-26 (cf. 1.22) where the same antithesis is elaborated. Moreover, immediately preceding the words in Clement is a citation from Pr. 3.34—a citation found also in Jas. 4.6. It thus seems more probable that Clement is alluding to James rather than to Mt. 7.¹ However, bearing in mind the close relationship between James and the Sermon on the Mount,² it may well be that we have here an indirect allusion to the Matthean material.

There is the possibility of an allusion to Mt. 7.13f. in the words of Cl. 48.4 :

πολλῶν οὖν πυλῶν ἀνεφγνῶν ἡ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν ᾗ μακάριοι πάντες οἱ εἰσελθόντες καὶ κατευθύνοντες τὴν πορείαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, ἀταράχως πάντα ἐπιτελοῦντες.

The resemblance of the two passages is very general, the only verbal contacts being found in Mt.'s πύλη, and the common verb εἰσερχομαι. Although in Mt. two gates and two ways are specified, Clement having mentioned many gates, goes on to speak only of the one gate, and that in terms very different from Mt. Moreover, as pointed out by Knopf and Massaux,³ the metaphor of "gates", "doors", and "ways" was widespread in the early Church.⁴ Thus while the present passage may be mentioned as a possible allusion to Mt., it seems rather unlikely that much can be made of it.

The words of Clement in 16.17 may possibly be an allusion to the ζυγός of Mt. 11.29f. After the quotation of a portion of Ps. 22, which is applied to Jesus, Clement writes :

ὁρᾶτε, ἄνδρες ἀγαπητοί, τίς ὁ ὑπογραμμὸς ὁ δεδομένος ἡμῖν · εἰ γὰρ ὁ κύριος οὕτως ἐταπεινοφρόνησεν, τί ποιήσωμεν ἡμεῖς οἱ ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐλθόντες ;

Although there is some difference between the yoke described in Mt. as χρηστός, and Clement's yoke τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, it is striking that both occur in the context of Christ's humility, Mt.'s ὅτι πραῦς

¹ For further discussion of this clause, see p. 241f.

² See e.g. M. H. Shepherd, "The Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew", *JBL* 75 (1956), 40-51. Cf. J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*³ (London, 1910), p. LXII.

³ Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 124f.; Massaux, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

⁴ Cf. Lk. 13.24; Jn. 10.9; Did. 1.1; Heras, *Sim.* IX, 11, 1ff.; Ign. *Phila.* IX, 1. Resch predictably regards πύλη and θύρα as translational variants going back to a common original. *Agrapha*¹, p. 24.

εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ corresponding to Clement's ὁ κύριος οὕτως ἐταπεινοφρόνησεν. Here again, however, we are dealing with a metaphor common in early Jewish literature. Thus in the Mishna one reads of the yoke of Torah (*Aboth* 3.8), and elsewhere of the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven (*Berakoth* 13a) and the yoke of Wisdom (Sir. 51.26).¹ Accordingly, it seems difficult to allow more than the mere possibility that Clement is here alluding to Mt.²

Massaux has argued at length³ that Mt. 26.28 is being alluded to by Clement in the words of 7.4 :

ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ γνῶμεν, ὡς ἔστιν τίμιον τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθὲν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανόας χάριν ὑπήμεγκεν.

Here the words αἷμα and ἐκχύννομαι are shared with the Synoptic account of the institution of the Eucharist. Clement, however, also refers to the purpose or result of the shedding of Christ's blood : τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, and μετανόας χάριν. Of the Synoptics, only Mt. speaks of that purpose or result in the added words : εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Here we have not only similarity, but dependence of Clement upon Mt., according to Massaux. In the emphasis upon μετάνοια, he says, there is development of the Matthean εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν and an indication of the theological activity of the first century Church. Massaux regards the emphasis on the μετανόας χάριν as not typically Pauline, and because of the lack of verbal parallels between our passage and the account of the institution of the Eucharist in 1 Cor. 11, he refuses to believe that Clement could here be dependent upon Pauline teaching. But granted all this it is still difficult to know how Massaux can be so sure that Clement is dependent on Mt. 26.28. It is mere speculation to allege that Clement's account of the purpose or result of the shedding of Christ's blood is developed from, and dependent upon, Mt.'s εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. The only significant parallel between the two passages is found in the verb ἐκχύννομαι, and this is not sufficient to substantiate alleged dependence. Moreover, Massaux fails to discuss other possible sources of the passage in the

¹ For the various "yokes" found in Jewish literature see Strack and Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, I, 608-610. Cf. Rengstorff on ζυγός in *TDNT* II, 900; and Köster, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

² Lightfoot (I, 2, 62) simply says that Clement's verbal paradox of a "yoke of grace" is "explained by the 'easy yoke' of Mt. 11.29-30", thus leaving unclear whether he regards the metaphor as an allusion to Mt. Surprisingly, Massaux does not discuss the ζυγός passage in Clement.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 18ff.

early Church, an omission which is more significant in light of Clement's description of the blood of Christ as *τίμιον*—an adjective similarly applied to Christ's blood in 1 Pet. 1.19 (and with *παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν*, cf. 2. Pet. 3.9).¹ It seems not very likely then, despite Massaux, that we have here an allusion to Mt.

Other possible allusions to the Synoptic Gospels which have been suggested or which may be sought out with the help of a concordance must remain very doubtful for the reason that they are based solely on one or two words (e.g. the *μείζων* of 48.6 with Mt. 23.11; the *ἐπισκοπῇ* of 50.3 with Lk. 19.44; the *ἐκλεξάμενος* of 64.1 with Lk. 9.35; *σοφίας* and *συνέσεως* in 32.4 with Mt. 11.25). The employment of these rather common words by Clement may simply be fortuitous, and even if they have been borrowed, because they are in common usage it is impossible to determine their sources with any degree of certainty.

Only in one instance does the occurrence of isolated words or pairs of words seem to be of significance. Because of the number of these that Clement has in common with the Lucan narrative of the nativity it may well be correct to allow that Clement was familiar with and employed that narrative in the composition of his letter. Thus in 48.4 we have *ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ*, words found identically in Lk. 1.75; the words of 63.2 *χαρὰν καὶ ἀγαλλίασιν* are found similarly linked in Lk. 1.14. Additionally, in 7.5 *γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ* may be compared with Lk. 1.50; in 17.2 the reference to *τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ* with Lk. 2.9; and Clement's frequent reference to Christ as *δεσπότης*, a term found in Lk. 2.29. Most important, however, is the number of parallels to Lk.'s nativity narrative found in the prayer of chapters 59-61. There is a basic similarity in tone and content between Clement's prayer on the one hand and Mary's Magnificat (Lk. 1.46ff.) and the prophecy of Zacharias (Lk. 1.68ff.) on the other. Specifically one may point out Clement's *τὸν ποιῶντα ταπεινούς εἰς ὕψος καὶ τοὺς ὑψηλοὺς ταπεινοῦντα, τὸν πλουτίζοντα καὶ πτωχίζοντα* (59.3) with Lk. 1.52f.; Clement's *ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς ἀδίκως* (60.3) with Lk. 1.71; Clement's *ποιῆσαι ταῦτα καὶ περισσότερα ἀγαθὰ μεθ' ἡμῶν* (61.3) with Lk. 1.72. Of course, the material of Luke's account of the nativity, and in particular the words of Mary and Zacharias are heavily dependent upon the OT Scriptures, and thus where Clement apparently alludes to Lk., he may in his prayer be depen-

¹ See below, p. 239.

dent upon the OT directly, or, more probably, indirectly through the commonly used language of worship which was full of biblical phraseology. Thus Köster concludes that the relationship between the passages in Clement and Lk. is not due to direct dependence but is the result of the influence of "die durch die Psalmen geprägte jüdisch-christliche Gebetssprache".¹

Indeed, some have seen in Clement's prayer (and elsewhere in the epistle)² certain liturgical language which is taken to reflect the liturgy employed in the Roman Church of Clement's day.³ Parallels have been pointed out, for example, between the Jewish liturgical prayer *Shemoneh Esreh* ("The Eighteen" Benedictions) and Clement's epistle (largely from the prayer of chapter 59-61, but also from other parts of the epistle).⁴ While there is no question concerning the liturgical character of Clement's language in chapter 59-61, it is impossible to know whether and to what extent Clement may be borrowing from a fixed Roman liturgy. The subject of early Christian liturgy is difficult and obscure, and because of the lack of any independent evidence, any assertion that Clement is directly dependent upon a fixed liturgy must remain purely

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 20. M. Wilcox, who presents parallels in a table, also concludes that both Luke and Clement "were drawing upon language and modes of expression current in the early Church". *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford, 1965), p. 73. For a thorough discussion of the language of the Lucan nativity narrative, see Joan Wragg, "St. Luke's Nativity Narrative, with Special Reference to the Canticles in the Light of the Jewish and Early Christian Background", Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Manchester University, 1965.

² 33.2-6; 34.5-8; 38.3-4. For a discussion of the important passage in chapter 34, see W. C. van Unnik, "I Clement 34 and the 'Sanctus'", *VC* 5 (1951), 204-248. Van Unnik, after a detailed exegesis of the passage, concludes that Clement is neither referring to the liturgy of the "Sanctus" nor even to the Eucharist in the passage, but that the background is eschatological and the meeting referred to, one simply of prayer.

³ E.g. H. Lietzmann, *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*, trans. Woolf (London, 1949), p. 199ff. L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, trans. M. L. McClure (London, 1927), p. 50ff. O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship* (London, 1953), p. 13. W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford, 1925), p. 102. This Roman liturgy is not to be confused with the later so-called "Clementine liturgy" which is found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Book VIII. P. Drews examining in detail the parallels between Cl. 59-61 and the latter has concluded that the same liturgical tradition underlies both passages. *Untersuchungen über die sogen. Clementinische Liturgie in VIII Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen* (Tübingen, 1906), pp. 12-56.

⁴ Lightfoot has set in two columns a selection of the Benedictions (first, second, seventeenth and eighteenth), and parallels from Clement's epistle. I, 1, 394f. Cf. Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 127ff.; 136f.; 139f; where comparison is made with the Shema Benediction, *Geullah*. See also, E. Werner, "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis", *Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume II* (Jerusalem, 1965), p. 809ff.

conjectural.¹ Similarly, because of the general character of the parallels to the Lucan nativity narrative and because of the nature of the language itself, it is difficult to conclude that Clement is here in fact alluding to Lk. Indeed, keeping the whole of the epistle in mind there is no reason to believe that Clement himself may not have combined these expressions of worship *de novo*, employing at random such liturgical language as came to mind while he wrote.²

Thus, of the apparent allusions to Synoptic material which have been discussed, only one is convincing—the sower of 24.5. The remainder range from the possible to the improbable and can often be explained simply as having been caused by the common fund of Jewish-Christian terminology. Accordingly, neither the two citations of the words of Jesus nor the supposed allusions to Synoptic material enable us to affirm with complete confidence that Clement was dependent upon the written Synoptic Gospels as we know them today.

C. OT CITATIONS FOUND ALSO IN THE SYNOPTICS

In several instances Clement cites OT passages which happen also to be cited in the Synoptic Gospels. In at least two of these instances Clement's citation exhibits readings which agree with the Synoptic reading of the quotation against that of the LXX. This may possibly indicate that Clement was influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by the readings found in the written Gospels.

The first of these occurs in 15.2, to which are added the parallels in the following columns.

¹ For the same conclusion, see L. A. Foster "Clement of Rome and his Literary Sources", Unpublished Harvard University Doctoral Dissertation 1957-58, p. 201. "Clement is still an important witness to the language and prayer of the early church but cannot be used in any positive way for the fixed nature of the Roman liturgy at the end of the first century".

² Cf. Lightfoot I, I, 396. Cf. Grant's conclusion: "Actually the prayer contains many of the themes developed earlier in the letter, and one may suppose that Clement was capable of praying without following a fixed model". *AF* I, 178.

<i>Clement</i> (15.2) Text of A :	LXX (Is. 29.13) Text of Ziegler, Göttingen LXX :	NT (Mk. 7.6 [and Mt. 15.8 but for δ λαὸς οὗτος])	<i>Clement of Alexandria</i> (<i>Stromata</i> IV, 32, 4) Text of Stählin :
λέγει γάρ που· οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσιν με τιμᾷ ἡ δὲ καρδιά αὐτῶν πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.	ἐγγίζει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσίν με ἡ δὲ καρδιά αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.	οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσιν με τιμᾷ ἡ δὲ καρδιά αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.	ὁ γὰρ λαὸς ὁ ἕτερος τοῖς χεῖλεσι τιμᾷ ἡ δὲ καρδιά αὐτοῦ πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἀπὸ κυρίου.

There is some discrepancy concerning the text of the Roman Clement in the codices A and C.¹ However, that both *χεῖλεσιν* and *ἄπεστιν* are the correct readings is attested by their presence in the Alexandrian Clement's citation of the passage.² It is clear that the latter is citing his Roman namesake and not the NT or some now unknown MS of the LXX from the fact that this citation occurs in the midst of a series of citations (*Stromata* IV, 32, 2 to 33, 4) taken from the Roman Clement (14.5 to 16.2)—a series which consists of no less than five OT passages (from Ps. 37; Is. 29; Pss. 62; 78; and 12) given in precisely the same sequence though sometimes connected with the Alexandrian's own material and most significantly, concluding with a sentence taken from the Roman Clement himself (without acknowledgement).³

The passage then as found in Clement of Rome agrees with the NT against the LXX in the following particulars: the order of the words *οὗτος ὁ λαός*; the lack of the *αὐτῶν* following *χεῖλεσιν*; and the *με τιμᾷ* for *τιμῶσίν με*.⁴ Only in the final *ἄπεστιν* does Clement differ

¹ C reads *ὁ λαὸς οὗτος*; *τῷ στόματι* for *τοῖς χεῖλεσιν* and *ἀπέχει* for *ἄπεστιν*. It is probable that these variants are the result of the harmonizing tendencies of this MS.

² For *χεῖλεσιν* we have the witness of the Latin, Syriac, and Coptic versions. The versions are inconclusive concerning *ἄπεστιν*.

³ E. Hatch argued that in these citations Clement of Alexandria was an independent witness to a common source in the form of a manual of *excerpta*. *Essays in Biblical Greek*, (Oxford, 1889), p. 205. This for the reasons stated is highly improbable. For further discussion see above p. 110. Cf. M. Mees, *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien* (Bari, 1970), I, 56.

⁴ Codex B and a large number of cursive MSS of the LXX (see Holmes and Parsons, *in loc*) insert after *ὁ λαὸς οὗτος* the words *ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν...* Hatch infers that the longer reading is the earlier but that the shorter gained currency before Clement's time. Cf. *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 178.

from the NT (which here agrees with the LXX's ἀπέχει).¹ From this comparison it may be seen that Clement is citing either from the Gospels or from a recension of the LXX or some other source now unknown to us.²

The same citation occurs in 2 Cl. 3.5 where, with the exception of the word order ὁ λαὸς οὗτος, it is in exact agreement with the citation in 1 Clement. Because of the commonly admitted dependence of 2 Clement on the genuine epistle, a natural explanation of the common citations is that the author of 2 Clement borrowed his from 1 Clement. Köster, however, has argued that because in 2 Clement the citation is introduced as specifically from Isaiah (λέγει δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἑσαΐα), while in 1 Clement the source remains indefinite (λέγει γάρ που), it cannot have been borrowed from 1 Clement. He rather quickly concludes that both citations were independently drawn from an early source no longer extant.³ Yet it is certainly not difficult to believe that the author copied the verse from 1 Clement and, knowing himself that the verse was from Isaiah, made the introductory formula specific. Köster makes no mention of the fact that in Mk. and Mt. the citation is identified as from Isaiah. It is possible that the author of 2 Clement took the citation from the NT,⁴ or at the least knew from the latter that the citation was to be found in Isaiah.

Massaux contends that the dependence of 1 Clement on Mt. is clear from the fact that both citations occur in a context concerned with hypocrisy. Thus Mt. in the preceding verse uses the term ὑποκριταί in referring to the Pharisees, and Clement in the preceding verse refers to τοῖς μεθ' ὑποκρίσεως. Massaux writes: "Le terme ὑποκρίσεως a pu rappeler à l'évêque romain les ὑποκριταί de Mt. et Mc. et provoquer la citation d'Isaïe telle que ces deux évangélistes la donnent".⁵ But this argument is purely speculative because the citation itself

¹ In Mk. 7.6 codices L and θ read ἄπεισιν; codex Δ reads ἀπέστη; and codex D ἀφίστηκεν. In the Matthean parallel, D and lat read simply ἐστίν. The MSS reading ἄπεισιν have possibly been influenced by the reading in the two Clements.

² None of the extant MSS of the LXX follow the Hebrew of the MT closely (the longer readings of B and L are closer than the others). Of course, it is possible that in the first century there existed a Hebrew Vorlage which gave rise to the current LXX reading and/or the reading of Mk.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁴ The obstacle here is that 2 Clement (like 1 Clement) has ἄπεισιν for the Synoptic ἀπέχει. Massaux, however, ignores the discrepancy and alleges that 2 Clement is dependent upon Mt. *Op. cit.*, p. 143f. Cf. also Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 23. Cf. Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 72f.

with its unforgettable description of hypocrisy would be brought to mind entirely apart from any occurrence of the word ὑποκριταί in the immediate context. Could the citation occur in a context concerned with anything but hypocrisy? Moreover, Massaux fails to explain why Clement has ἄπεισιν for Mt.'s ἀπέχει.

This latter is, indeed, the crux of the matter so far as dependence upon the NT is concerned. Surprisingly, those who regard the citation as dependent upon the NT have not attempted to explain Clement's ἄπεισιν. Sanday, for example, writes: "Altogether I cannot but regard this passage as the strongest evidence we possess for the use of the Synoptic Gospels by Clement; it seems to carry the presumption that he did use them up to a considerable degree of probability". Yet no account is given of the presence of ἄπεισιν.¹ H. B. Swete called attention to the problem when he wrote "Clement's [citation] is close to that of the Evangelists, but has not been borrowed from them in their present form, as ἄπεισιν shews".²

There can be no certainty here as to the source of Clement's citation. It is possible that Clement had access to a recension of the LXX unknown to us, or that he borrowed the citation from a no longer extant collection of excerpts or *testimonia*. Such a document, however, can be considered the common source of both the NT's and Clement's citation only with difficulty since it cannot account for both the ἀπέχει and ἄπεισιν. However, rather than to postulate the existence of a document for which we have no tangible evidence, it would seem better to accept the easier hypothesis that Clement is dependent upon the NT, and allow that the ἀπέχει was changed to ἄπεισιν wilfully or accidentally, by Clement or a later scribe. We accept as probable then that the form of this OT citation indicates dependence upon, and thus Clement's acquaintance with, either Mk. (more probably) or Mt. Alternatively, however, the similar form of the two citations may be explained by means of oral tradition.³

¹ *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 70. Cf. Lightfoot I, 2, 55.

² *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, 1900), p. 410. This is also apparently what Köster has in mind when he notes differences between the text of Clement and that of the Synoptics. *Op. cit.*, p. 22. That Clement cites only the first part (but the main part) of Is. 29.13 whereas the NT cites it in its entirety seems unimportant.

³ Thus Westcott writes of the citation, "The passage is just one of those general statements which easily become moulded orally into a traditional form, and it appears to be quite insufficient to shew that Clement was dependent for it on the text of St. Mark". *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the NT* (London, 1896), p. 44.

The second instance where an OT citation in Clement may indicate a knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels is found in the citation of 4.10 (text of A): *τίς σε κατέστησεν κριτὴν ἢ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν; μὴ ἀνελεῖν με σὺ θέλεις, ὃν τρόπον ἀνείλες ἐχθρὸς τὸν Αἰγύπτιον*; This is in exact agreement with the LXX text (Codex B; Codex A, nearly so) of Ex. 2.14 with the exception of the *κριτὴν ἢ δικαστὴν* for which the LXX reads *ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν*. It may be that Clement has written *κριτὴν ἢ* recalling the statement of Jesus in Lk. 12.14: *τίς με κατέστησεν κριτὴν ἢ μεριστὴν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*;¹ Lightfoot and Grant seem cautiously to favour the possibility.² It should be noted, however, that among the various witnesses to the *ipsissima verba* of Clement, only Codex A reads *κριτὴν ἢ μεριστὴν*. Codex C, the Latin, Syriac, and two Coptic versions all agree with the LXX reading *ἄρχοντα καὶ* (but Latin: *aut* for *καί*). The explanation usually assumed is that this latter reading is the result of early harmonization with the LXX occurring in one archetypal Greek MS from which all the versions may derive, or multiple harmonization occurring in the respective sources or in the versions themselves. But it is equally possible, if not more probable, that Codex C and the versions witness to the original reading of Clement, and that the *κριτὴν ἢ* is due to the conscious or unconscious recalling of the Lucan passage not by Clement himself, but by a scribe somewhere in the lineage of the text of Clement found in Codex A. We have here a possible, but not a certain indication that Clement was influenced by a knowledge of Lk.

In the remaining instances of OT quotations common to Clement and the Synoptics, the text of Clement agrees with that of the LXX against that found in the NT. The citation³ of Ps. 21.7-9 found in 16.15-16 illustrates this:

ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι σκώληξ καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, ὄνειδος ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐξουθένημα λαοῦ · πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντές με ἐξεμυκτήρισάν με, ἐλάλησαν ἐν χεῖλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν · ἤλπισεν ἐπὶ κύριον, ῥυσάσθω αὐτόν, σωσάτω αὐτόν, ὅτι θέλει αὐτόν.

This is in verbatim agreement with Codex B of the LXX with the unimportant exception of the plural genitive *ἀνθρώπων* for B's *ἀνθρώπου* (x, however, has the plural). Where this passage is cited or clearly

¹ The Received Text and *θ* have *δικαστὴν* for *κριτὴν*, apparently as the result of harmonization with the LXX text and the text of the citation found in Acts 7.27.

² Lightfoot I, 2, 24; Grant, *AF* II, 24.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, the numeration of the Psalm passages follows that of the LXX.

alluded to in the NT, the text differs from that of the LXX. Thus in Mk. 15.29 (exactly parallel in Mt. 27.39) we read: ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν. A more significant parallel is found in Mt. 27.43: πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ῥυσάσθω νῦν εἰ θέλει αὐτόν. Also the successive words θεωρῶν ἐξεμυκτήριζον of Lk. 23.34-35 may be mentioned. Since these parallels lack introductory formulae it may be questioned to what extent they represent a specific text (LXX or otherwise).¹ What can be said with certainty, however, is that Clement's text here shows no influence on the part of the Synoptic Gospels.

The same may be said concerning the citation of Ps. 49.14-15 in Cl. 52.3. The specific clause concerned is: καὶ ἀπόδος τῷ ὑψίστῳ τὰς εὐχὰς σου, which agrees exactly with the reading of the LXX. Its equivalent is found in Mt. 5.33: ἀποδώσεις δὲ τῷ κυρίῳ τοὺς ὄρκους σου. Again the reading of Mt. differs from the LXX and has had no influence upon the text of Clement. The same citation is present in Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 113, 3), who has probably borrowed it from the Roman Clement—witness the successive quotations from Ps. 68 and 49 in both, and especially the first words of the former citation ἐξομολογήσομαι τῷ κυρίῳ, which are found neither in the LXX nor the Hebrew. The Alexandrian Clement, however, does appear to have been affected by Mt. 5.33 since in our clause he has substituted τῷ κυρίῳ for τῷ ὑψίστῳ.² Clement of Rome, however, here shows no sign of such influence from Mt.

The remaining instances have for various reasons an added element of uncertainty. Thus the words of Mt. 5.8, οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, may be an allusion to Ps. 50.12 which is quoted in Cl. 18.10. This is not certain, however, for Mt. may equally well be alluding to Ps. 23.4 or Ps. 72.1, or perhaps not alluding to any particular passage at all. The question is of no importance to us, however, since Mt.'s phrase bears no close resemblance to Clement's text, which agrees precisely with the LXX.

A similarly uncertain instance is found in Mt. 6.6 where the words εἰσελθε εἰς τὸ ταμιεῖόν σου constitute a probable allusion to Is. 26.20 (the whole of the Mt. 6 citation however is also close to 2 Ki.

¹ For a discussion of this question and the general problem of non-Septuagintal quotations in Mt. see R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden, 1967).

² The LXX's τῷ ὑψίστῳ more accurately translates the Hebrew לעליון.

4.33), a passage which also seems to be cited in Cl. 50.4. Despite an elision of some five words, Clement's text agrees generally with that of the LXX. This citation, however, is combined under the same rubric with words of unknown origin, the latter of which possibly bear some relationship with Ezk. 37.12. If the whole of the citation be regarded as a unity and thus derived from one source, that source is unknown to us.¹ Concerning our clause, Clement lacks the final σοῦ, agrees with the LXX in having the neuter plural for Mt.'s τὸ ταμειῖον, and differs from both the LXX and Mt. in the plural εἰσέλθετε.² Clearly, there is no hint of Mt.'s possible influence on Clement at this point.

One of the favourite OT texts of the early Church, Ps. 109.1, has found its way into Clement's epistle, 36.5: *κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου*. This agrees exactly with the text of the LXX, and it agrees exactly with the text of the citation found in the Synoptics (Mk. 12.36; Mt. 22.44; Lk. 20.42f.).³ The same quotation is also found verbatim in Heb. 1.13. Since in all these texts the citation is identical, Clement may have borrowed from any of them; yet it is more probable that he is here dependent upon the LXX or Hebrews (both of which it is certain he knew).

Finally may be mentioned the reference to the repentance of the Ninevites in 7.7. Was Clement influenced by the Synoptics (Mt. 12.41 and Lk. 11.32) in citing this example? The question here is not one of textual parallels, but one of suggestion. However, it is extremely improbable that we are to see Synoptic influences here. Clement's reference to Jonah and the Ninevites belongs with the catalogue of examples found in chapters 9-12 (cf. the words of 7.5: *διέλθωμεν εἰς τὰς γενεὰς πάσας, καὶ καταμάθωμεν ὅτι ἐν γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ μετανοίας τόπον ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐπιστραφῆναι ἐπ' αὐτόν*). Thus rather than an isolated reference to Jonah (and a reflection of the Synoptic passages), we have one member of a series of

¹ For a further discussion of the passage, see p. 63.

² Whether this ending is plural or singular cannot be determined from Codex A. However, Codex C and the versions, support the plural.

³ There is, however, some confusion concerning *ὑποπόδιον*. In Mk. and Mt. *ὑποκάτω* is the better attested reading, the *ὑποπόδιον* probably resulting from harmonization. Only in Lk. is *ὑποπόδιον* the preferred reading.

examples. This listing of examples was a common device employed in argumentative treatises of Clement's age.¹

From these OT citations and allusions common to both Clement and the NT, it may be concluded that in only one instance (that of Is. 29.13) does it seem at all probable that Clement betrays a knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels. If we add to this the allusion to the Synoptics in 24.5, it may be said that we have evidence (slight though it be) that Clement probably knew at least one, if not more than one, of the Synoptics. This slight probability exists independently of any possible literary dependence upon the Synoptics for the citation of Jesus' words in 13.2 and 46.8, against which we have already argued. Moreover, the probability is heightened inasmuch as we know of no particular reason to believe that written copies of the Synoptic Gospels were not already in possession of the leaders of the Church in the Empire's leading city.²

¹ Compare Heb. 11; for a parallel example in Jewish literature see Sir. 44ff.; for examples in Hellenistic literature, see L. Sanders, *L'Hellénisme de Saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme* (Louvain, 1943), p. 6 ff.

² E. Barnikol argued that had Clement known Mk. (1.1) he would not have used the phrase ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (47.1) to refer to 1 Corinthians. "Die Nichtkenntnis des Markusevangeliums in der römischen Clemensgemeinde um 100". *Theologische Jahrbücher* 4 (1936), 142f. If, however, ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου refers to the time of pioneer evangelization (as in Phil. 4.15) the argument cannot be made to stand. Cf. the argument of Knoch that Clement had "den heutigen synoptischen text des Mk-Evangeliums vor Augen". *Op. cit.*, p. 73.

CHAPTER SIX

CLEMENT'S USE OF HEBREWS AND THE PAULINE EPISTLES

A. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Clement's acquaintance with and dependence upon the Epistle to the Hebrews is acknowledged by nearly everyone. Indeed, so conspicuous are the similarities between the two epistles that already in the second or third century Clement was alleged to be the author of Hebrews.¹ Eusebius himself spoke of Clement's use of Hebrews in the following words : ἐν ᾗ [Clement's epistle] τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους πολλὰ νοήματα παραθείς, ἥδη δὲ καὶ αὐτολεξεῖ ῥητοῖς τισιν ἐξ αὐτῆς χρησάμενος, σαφέστατα παρίστησιν ὅτι μὴ νέον ὑπάρχει τὸ σύγγραμμα (*HE* III, 38, 1). He also refers to the tradition that Clement was the translator of the epistle,² adding the words : ὁ καὶ μᾶλλον ἂν εἴη ἀληθὲς τῷ τὸν ὁμοιον τῆς φράσεως χαρακτήρα τὴν τε τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολὴν καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἀποσώζειν καὶ τῷ μὴ πόρρω τὰ ἐν ἑκατέροις τοῖς συγγράμμασι νοήματα καθεστάναι (*HE* III, 38, 3).

While in Clement we have neither verbatim citation nor an acknowledgement of dependence, the parallels and allusions to Hebrews are striking. Perhaps the clearest of these is found in Cl. 36 :

Clement 36.2 (Text of A)

ὁς ὦν ἀπαύγασμα
τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ,
τοσοῦτῳ μείζων ἐστὶν ἀγγέλων,
ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον
ὄνομα κεκληρονόμηκεν.

Hebrews 1.3,4 (Text of Nestle-Aland)

ὁς ὦν ἀπαύγασμα
τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ κτλ.
τοσοῦτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων
ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοῦς
κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα.

Clement agrees exactly with the opening words of Heb. 1.3 except for the substitution of *μεγαλωσύνης* for *δόξης*. This substitution, however, may well be explained by the fact that *μεγαλωσύνης* occurs in the last

¹ Thus Eusebius records the following words of Origen concerning the authorship of Hebrews : τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν, ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ὑπὸ τινῶν μὲν λεγόντων ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψεν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, ὑπὸ τινῶν δὲ ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς Πράξεις. *HE* VI, 25, 14.

² Cf. Jerome, *de Viris Illustribus* 15.

half of the verse (1.3) among the words omitted by Clement. After the rather considerable omission, Clement continues with words very close to Heb. 1.4, substituting *μείζων* for *κρείττων* and *ἐστίν* for the participle *γενόμενος*, and omitting the definite article before *ἀγγέλων*,¹ and the words *παρ' αὐτούς* after *διαφορώτερον*. Also to be mentioned is the transposition of the words *κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα* which is found in Clement (but C here agrees with Hebrews).

There can be little question but that here Clement is dependent upon the text of Hebrews. Indeed, such a conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Clement continues with the citation of three passages from the Psalms, all of which are found in the first chapter of Hebrews, and one of which agrees with the text of Hebrews against that of the LXX.

The first of these, Ps. 103.4 (LXX), is found in Cl. 36.3 immediately following the parallels to Heb. 1.3,4: *γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως · ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα*.² Clement is in verbatim agreement with the citation as found in Heb. 1.7, but diverges from the text of the LXX in the last two words, for which the latter reads: *πῦρ φλέγον*.³ Clement's introductory formula, however, does not refer to the angels as does that of Hebrews: *πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει*. Nevertheless, the agreement in text does seem to indicate that Clement has taken the citation from Hebrews rather than directly from the LXX.

The second citation with which Clement continues is from Ps. 2.7,8. These are the words in 36.4: *ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ δεσπότης · υἱός μου εἰ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε · αἰτησαι παρ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου καὶ τὴν κατὰσχέσιν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς*. This citation agrees exactly with the LXX text. Only the first part of the citation (i.e. *to γεγέννηκά σε*) is found in Heb. 1.5 (also in 5.5. and Acts 13.33) where it is in exact agreement with both Clement and the LXX.⁴ From the text of the citation alone, then, one cannot argue for Clement's dependence upon

¹ In the text of Hebrews, P⁴⁶ and B also omit the definite article. These independent witnesses to the omission of the article combined with the witness of Clement of Rome have led G. Zuntz to regard the anarthrous *ἀγγέλων* as the true reading of the Hebrews text. See *The Text of the Epistles* (London, 1953), p. 218.

² The text of A. C differs in the transposition *φλόγα πυρός* (cf. Rev. 2.18).

³ Thus B and S. A has *πυρὸς φλέγα*, regarded by Lightfoot as reflecting a transitional state of the text.

⁴ The second part of the citation, Ps. 2.8, is nowhere quoted in the NT although it is alluded to in Rev. 2.26.

Hebrews. The introductory formula, however, in its contrasting reference ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ νύῳ αὐτοῦ, betrays a knowledge of the contrast made in Heb. 1. To be sure, the contrast there is not made in the introductory formula to the present citation, but rather in introducing a citation from Ps. 44.7 (Heb. 1.8), a citation not found in Clement. Nonetheless, Clement's context provides assurance that this phrase in the introductory formula is also to be taken as an allusion to Heb. 1.

The third citation, from Ps. 109.1, is found in 36.5: καὶ πάλιν λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν · κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. The text, here again, is identical with both the LXX and Heb. 1.13. The words πρὸς αὐτόν of the introductory formula, while not asking the question πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἶρηκέν ποτε (Heb. 1.13), indirectly reflect a knowledge of the contrast in the mind of the author of Hebrews.

These three citations from the Psalms add considerable weight to the argument that Clement knew and borrowed from the Epistle to the Hebrews. Although they do not occur in the same order in Hebrews (there Ps. 2.7 is quoted first), nor are they successive in Hebrews (quotations from 2 Sa., Dt., and other Psalms are interspersed between the three found in Clement), both writers conclude their argument with the citation from Ps. 109.1. This difference in the order of the citations, and especially the additional verse (Ps. 2.8), not found in Hebrews, raises the question whether Clement may provide independent witness to a Testimony Book¹ or *testimonia*² which may have been used by the author of Hebrews. Against such an hypothesis, however, is the fact that Ps. 103.4, which finds place in the work of neither Harris nor Dodd, can hardly have formed part of a collection of Messianic testimonies.³ As for Clement's addition of verse 8 to Ps. 2.7, he may here unconsciously reflect the common usage of the entire Psalm for apologetic purposes in the first century.⁴ Accordingly, we

¹ See R. Harris, *Testimonies*, Part II (Cambridge, 1920), p. 43ff.

² Dodd is reluctant to admit the existence of a first century written testimony source and argues for collections of *testimonia* employed orally as fundamental texts supporting the kerygma. Two of our citations (Ps. 2.7 and 109.1) find places among his list of testimonies. *According to the Scriptures* (London, [first published 1952], 1965), p. 31ff. See above, p. 93ff.

³ The fact that the citation is not Messianic is also noted by the Oxford Committee. *NTAF*, p. 46.

⁴ This supports Dodd's conclusion that "the whole psalm was regarded as a description of messiahship, fulfilled in the mission and destiny of Jesus". *According to the Scrip-*

conclude that the presence of these three citations in Clement, the agreement against the LXX in Ps. 103.4, and the information gained from the introductory formulae, when combined with the borrowed words preceding the citations, make it quite certain that Clement is dependent upon Hebrews.

There is yet further indication in chapter 36 of Clement's dependence on Hebrews, although here the contact is more allusive. The chapter begins: αὐτῇ ἡ ὁδός, ἀγαπητοί, ἐν ἣ εὕρομεν τὸ σωτήριον ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν προσφορῶν ἡμῶν, τὸν προστάτην καὶ βοηθὸν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν. As for the opening words, ὁδός and possibly σωτήριον may reflect contact with Hebrews.¹ Ὀδός is an important word in Heb. 9.8 and 10.20 where it is used in very much the same way that Clement uses it; although the neuter form σωτήριον is not found, its equivalent σωτηρία is an important word in Hebrews, where it occurs more times than in any other NT book. The more important allusions, however, begin with the words τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν προσφορῶν ἡμῶν. Ἀρχιερεύς is, of course, one of the most important designations of Christ in Hebrews; the verb προσφέρω, and the noun προσφορά (see 10.5, 8, 10, 14, 18), are commonly used in describing the function of the ἀρχιερεύς (e.g. 8.3; 5.1). Clement's words τὸν προστάτην καὶ βοηθὸν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν may well be a reflection of what is stated negatively in Heb. 4.15: οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενον συμπαθεῖν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν, πεπειρασμένον δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. Although the word προστάτης does not occur in Hebrews (nor in the NT),² with βοηθός (cf. Heb. 13.6) we may compare the following words from Heb. 2.18f., especially in connection with the verse just cited: ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν αὐτὸς [πιστὸς ἀρχιερεύς 2.17] πειρασθεὶς, δύναται τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθεῖν.

Further allusions occur in the words with which Clement continues (36.2, text of A):

tures, p. 105. Massaux says concerning Clement's addition: "il a ajouté instinctivement le verset 8". *Op. cit.*, p. 61.

¹ It is difficult to believe with Nairne that the single word ἀγαπητοί (a word which occurs in Clement some 17 times) is an allusion to Heb. 6.9. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, CGT (Cambridge, 1917), p. xxxi.

² For the combination of ἀρχιερεύς and προστάτης see the doxologies of Cl. 61.3 and 64.1.

διὰ τούτου ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὰ ὕψη τῶν οὐρανῶν, διὰ τούτου ἐνοπτριζόμεθα τὴν ἁμωμον καὶ ὑπερτάτην ὄψιν αὐτοῦ, διὰ τούτου ἠνεώχθησαν ἡμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας, διὰ τούτου ἡ ἀσύνητος καὶ ἐσκοτωμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν ἀναθάλλει εἰς τὸ [θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ] φῶς, διὰ τούτου ἠθέλησεν ὁ δεσπότης τῆς ἀθανάτου γνώσεως ἡμᾶς γεύσασθαι.¹

The phrase εἰς τὰ ὕψη τῶν οὐρανῶν suggests comparison with Heb. 4.14 ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, or Heb. 7.26 [ἀρχιερεὺς] ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος. Nairne has suggested that the ἀτενίσωμεν here reflects the words of Heb. 12.2: ἀφορῶντες ... ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκάθικεν.² The latter clause, however, seems too far removed from the ἀφορῶντες to make the connection plausible. Clement in the words ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὰ ὕψη τῶν οὐρανῶν is most probably alluding to the free access to the very presence of God which is ours through our great High Priest (cf. Heb. 10.19ff.; 4.14). Ἀμωμος is found in Heb. 9.14, and a combination of terms similar to ἁμωμον καὶ ὑπερτάτην is found in Heb. 7.26: ἀρχιερεὺς, ὁσιος, ἁκακος, ἀμίαντος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, καὶ ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος. These particular allusions are admittedly tenuous and are brought forward only because Clement so clearly depends upon Hebrews in the immediate context. The last of these allusions, however, is somewhat more forceful. In the words διάνοια ἡμῶν ἀναθάλλει εἰς τὸ φῶς,³ and ἠθέλησεν ὁ δεσπότης τῆς ἀθανάτου γνώσεως ἡμᾶς γεύσασθαι, one sees a reflection of Heb. 6.4,5: τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας γευσσάμενους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ καλὸν γευσσάμενους θεοῦ ῥῆμα δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. The parallels are clear and striking, φῶς being analogous to φωτισθέντας, γεύσασθαι to the repeated participle γευσσάμενους, and τῆς ἀθανάτου γνώσεως being comparable to both τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου and δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.

Finally must be mentioned the suggestion of G. Zuntz that the

¹ The words διὰ τούτου ἡ ἀσύνητος κτλ. are quoted from the Roman Clement by Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* IV, 110, 2. The Alexandrian, however, has ἐσκοτωμένη for ἐσκοτωμένη (probably by influence from Rom. 1.12, Lightfoot); and εἰς τὸ φῶς, omitting θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ (see below, n. 3).

² *Op. cit.*, p. xxxi. C (supported by the Latin) reads ἀτενίζομεν probably so as to parallel the other indicatives following the repeated διὰ τούτου.. The Syriac may possibly support A's ἀτενίσωμεν. Both Coptic MSS lack chapter 36.

³ The text of A, τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς, as well as that of C, τὸ θαυμαστὸν φῶς appears to have been expanded favouring 1 Pet. 2.9. The Syriac and Latin agree with the simple τὸ φῶς; cf. Clement of Alexandria. Unfortunately both Coptic MSS are deficient at this point.

repeated διὰ τούτου of 36.1-2 may be traced back to Heb. 1.3 where P⁴⁶ and 1739 add the words δι' ἑαυτοῦ before καθαρισμόν.¹ This suggestion by its nature must remain conjectural, but if Clement's διὰ τούτου derives from Heb. 1, it could equally, and perhaps more probably, have come from the δι' οὗ of 1.2. There are, however, a number of other places in the epistle which could have inspired Clement's διὰ τούτου (cf. especially 13.15).

The whole of Cl. 36 then is an important witness to Clement's knowledge and use of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But Clement's familiarity with Hebrews is plain from other parts of his epistle as well. It is a particularly revealing fact that chapters 9-12 of Clement's epistle appear to be patterned after Heb. 11. Exhorting his readers to fix their gaze on those who have been faithful in obedience, Clement successively cites the examples of Enoch, Noah, and Abraham (9.2-10.3), precisely as is done in Heb. 11.5-8. In addition to the identical sequence, however, there are similarities in the descriptions. These are in part explainable by the respective OT passages (i.e. Enoch, Gn. 5.24; Noah, Gn. 6.8; Abraham, Is. 41.8) yet the actual resemblances between Clement's language and the LXX are relatively insignificant. The parallels with Hebrews, on the other hand, are notable. Thus in 9.3 Clement writes: λάβωμεν Ἐνῶχ, ὃς ἐν ὑπακοῇ δίκαιος εὐρεθεὶς μετετέθη, καὶ οὐχ εὐρέθη αὐτοῦ θάνατος, while in Heb. 11.5 we read: πίστει Ἐνῶχ μετετέθη τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, καὶ οὐχ ἠύρισκετο διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός.² The contacts between the descriptions of Noah (Cl. 9.4; Heb. 11.7) are few. Although both stress Noah's faith (Clement: Νῶε πιστὸς εὐρεθεὶς; Heb.: πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε), with respect to ὁ κόσμος, Hebrews selects the negative δι' ἧς κατέκρινεν τὸν κόσμον, while Clement speaks of the positive: παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν.³ As for Abraham, Clement writes (10.1f.):

πιστὸς εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν ὑπήκουον γενέσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασιν τοῦ θεοῦ · οὗτος δι' ὑπακοῆς ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, ὅπως γῆν ὀλίγην καὶ συγγένειαν ἀσθενῆ καὶ οἶκον μικρὸν καταλιπὼν κληρονομῆσιν τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τοῦ θεοῦ.

¹ *The Text of the Epistles*, p. 43.

² Lightfoot says "Clement is here copying Heb. 11.5 ... though the words are displaced, as often happens when the memory is trusted". I, 2, 42.

³ The word παλιγγενεσία which was in common use in describing the renewed earth (see Lightfoot for references), in Clement "appears to allude indirectly to the renewal of the Corinthian Church by repentance", Lightfoot, I, 2, 43. There are two NT occurrences of the word: Mt. 19.28; Tit. 3.5.

(Clement then fortifies his argument by citing the whole of Gn. 12.1-3 according to the LXX with only a few minor variations.) The parallels here with Heb. 11.8,9 are striking. In Hebrews, as in Clement, both the faith and obedience of Abraham are stressed (cf. also Jas. 2.21ff.). Thus the writer to the Hebrews begins: *πίστει καλούμενος Ἀβραάμ ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν ... καὶ ἐξῆλθεν*. Also similar to Clement are the words: *λαμβάνειν εἰς κληρονομίαν*, and the designation of Isaac and Jacob as *τῶν συγκληρονόμων τῆς ἐπαγγελίας* (the latter word occurring six times in Heb. 11; cf. also Heb. 6.15).

After a series of quotations from the LXX of Genesis, Clement, like the author to the Hebrews, refers to the faith connected with the birth of Isaac (though in Hebrews it is attributed to Sarah [11.11]), and the obedience of Abraham in offering Isaac (10.7): *διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐδόθη αὐτῷ υἱὸς ἐν γήρᾳ, καὶ δι' ὑπακοῆς προσήνεγκεν αὐτὸν θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ πρὸς τὸ ὅρος ὃ ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ*. Although the latter part of this passage seems to show contact with the account of the event in Gn. 22, in its present context an allusion to Heb. 11.17 seems fairly certain (cf. Jas. 2.21).

After devoting some words to the example of Lot and his wife (both of whom find no place in the catalogue of Heb. 11),¹ Clement gives a rather full account (chapter 12) of the story of Rahab and the spies. This example may possibly have been suggested to Clement by the mention of Rahab in Heb. 11, for Clement's summary of the story, in which he employs material which may be taken from the book of Joshua,² amounts to an expansion of the words of Heb. 11.31: *πίστει Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐ συναπώλετο τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν, δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκοποῦς μετ' εἰρήνης*. In Codex A, Clement's text (12.1) similarly describes Rahab as *ἡ πόρνη*, but considerable difficulty centres around the true reading at this point since Codex C inserts the word *ἐπιλεγομένη*, and is supported in this reading by all the versions (Latin, Syriac, and two Coptic).³ The reading of A however is also supported by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 105, 4) in a passage avowedly borrowed from the Roman Clement. Zuntz has argued that the original text of Clement included *ἐπιλεγομένη* and that the addition of the word in the $\aleph$ text of Heb. 11.31 is due to the influence

¹ For Clement's references to Lot, see below, p. 247.

² See p. 56f.

³ W. K. L. Clarke mistakenly says "the text A has *ἐπιλεγομένη*". *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*, p. 92.

of Clement's text. The omission of the word in Codex A of Clement (and in the Alexandrian Clement) is accordingly explained as the result of harmonization with the current (better) text of Hebrews.¹ However, it is the judgement of most modern editors of the text that the reading of A is to be preferred.² This reading is both the shorter and the more difficult, and thus the more likely to have been the original.

It must be pointed out, however, that Clement's dependence upon Hebrews at this point is not at all certain. Indeed, it seems more probable that Clement here reflects Jas. 2.25 where the same words, 'Ραὰβ ἡ πόρνη occur without any textual uncertainty.³

We conclude then that chapters 9-12 of Clement's epistle, although containing a certain amount of independent material, are patterned after Heb. 11.⁴ These four chapters, however, do not exhaust Clement's witness to the memorable eleventh chapter of Hebrews. A clear allusion to Heb. 11.37 is found in Cl. 17.1 : μιμηταὶ γενώμεθα κακείνων, οἵτινες ἐν δέρμασιν αἰγείois καὶ μηλωταῖς περιεπάτησαν κηρύσσοντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. λέγομεν δὲ Ἡλίαν καὶ Ἐλισαίε, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰεζεκιήλ, τοὺς προφῆτας · πρὸς τοῦτοις καὶ τοὺς μεμαρτυρημένους.⁵ The parallel clause in Heb. 11.37 is striking: περιῆλθον ἐν

¹ *The Text of the Epistles*, p. 218f. Zuntz does not mention the witness of the Coptic MSS, which would tend to strengthen his argument.

² E.g. Lightfoot, Lake, Knopf, Grant. Lightfoot, of course, was unaware of the witness of the Latin and two Coptic MSS. It is doubtful, however, that they would have changed his mind. For his arguments, see I, 1, 125 and 139.

³ See below, p. 250f. Clement's simple ἡ πόρνη may thus be explained as directly dependent upon Jas. 2.25. The addition of ἐπιλεγομένη in C and in the versions is probably to be traced back to a variant introduced, for theological reasons, in an early Greek copy of the letter and thereupon taken up in X*. This simple explanation has the advantage of avoiding Zuntz's double supposition that Clement originally inserted ἐπιλεγομένη and that later it was omitted by way of harmonization with Heb. 11.31.

⁴ While this is generally accepted, it has been questioned from time to time by those who argue that Clement and Hebrews independently derived the material from a piece of Jewish-Christian tradition. Thus W. Wrede, *Untersuchungen zum Ersten Klemensbriefe* (Göttingen, 1891), p. 70ff.; P. Drews, *Untersuchungen über die sogen. clementinische Liturgie im VIII Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen* I. Der 1. Clemensbriefe und die clementinische Liturgie (Tübingen, 1906), p. 23ff. The use of a common tradition is possible, yet in the light of Clement's clear knowledge and use of Hebrews elsewhere, it is more probable that he is also directly dependent upon Hebrews in the present instance.

⁵ The variations in the various MSS and versions are insignificant. A quotation of this passage is found in Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* IV, 105, 4, but as follows: δι' ὑπομονὴν καὶ πίστιν ἐν δέρμασιν αἰγείois καὶ μηλωταῖς καὶ τριχῶν καμηλείων πλέγμασιν περιεπάτησαν κηρύσσοντες τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, λεγομεν δὲ Ἡλίαν καὶ Ἐλισαίου, Ἰεζεκιήλ τε καὶ Ἰωάννην, τοὺς προφῆτας.

μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν. That Clement is in fact alluding to Heb. 11 is given away by his addition of λέγομεν δὲ ... τοὺς προφήτας. This last word is undoubtedly the counterpart of τῶν προφητῶν in Heb. 11.32, the identity of whom Clement wishes to disclose to his readers.¹ A final contact may be seen in Clement's τοὺς μεμαρτυρημένους with the words of Heb. 11.39: οὗτοι πάντες μαρτυρηθέντες.

Another example of Clement's desire to identify the unnamed heroes of Heb. 11 may be seen in 55.3ff. where, with the words πολλαὶ γυναικες ἐνδυναμωθείσαι διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιτελέσαντο πολλὰ ἀνδρεία, the examples of Judith and Esther are cited. These introductory words seem inspired by the words ἐδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας of Heb. 11.34, and the deeds of Judith and Esther correspond to the next words of Heb. 11.34: ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ, παρεμβολὰς ἔκλιναν ἄλλοτρίων. Although the writer to the Hebrews does not indicate that the words of 11.34 refer to women (women are, however, mentioned in 11.35), Clement pondering the import of ἀσθενεία, apparently determined that women were meant and chose his examples accordingly. The conclusion that Clement here alludes to Heb. 11 is reinforced by the fact that in 55.6 Esther is described as ἡ τελεία κατὰ πίστιν.²

Of remaining possible allusions to Heb. 11 we mention the following: Clement's use of δημιουργός (20.11) parallels the δημιουργός of Heb. 11.10, a hapax legomenon in the NT; more generally, the flight of Moses from Egypt (Cl. 4.10) is found in Heb. 11.27; and in 27.1 the reference to God as τῷ πιστῷ ἐν ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις is parallel in thought to πιστὸν ἠγγέσατο τὸν ἐπαγγειλάμενον of Heb. 11.11 (however, cf. also Heb. 10.23, πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος).

In addition to his dependence upon Heb. 11, Clement appears also to allude in several places to the following chapter, Heb. 12. An instance of this is found in the words of 19.2:

¹ F. F. Bruce has noted this intention of Clement's: "Clement was well acquainted with the Epistle to the Hebrews; in particular, he had studied this chapter and attempted to identify some of the heroes of faith who are here referred to anonymously". *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1964), p. 336. Clement of Alexandria, who paraphrases this passage from his Roman namesake, is constrained to add Ἰωάννης to the three prophets already named. (*Stromata* IV, 105, 4).

² See F. F. Bruce, *ibid.*, p. 336. Clement of Alexandria gives what is apparently a paraphrase of the passage concerning Judith and Esther. (*Stromata* IV, 118, 4f.).

πολλῶν οὖν καὶ μεγάλων καὶ ἐνδόξων μετεληφότες πράξεων ἐπαναδράμωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παραδεδομένον ἡμῖν τῆς εἰρήνης σκοπόν, καὶ ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸν πατέρα καὶ κτίστην τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου καὶ ταῖς μεγαλοπρεπέσι καὶ ὑπερβαλλούσαις αὐτοῦ δωρεαῖς τῆς εἰρήνης εὐεργεσίαις τε κολληθώμεν.

These words appear consciously or unconsciously to have been patterned after Heb. 12.1f. Although there are no verbal contacts between the two passages they are very similar in thought and in the succession of ideas. Thus the first clause of Clement's exhortation parallels the words of Heb. 12.1 : *τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς, τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περι- κείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων*. The connection between these clauses is made practically unquestionable by the opening words of the preceding sentence in Clement (19.1) : *τῶν τοσούτων οὖν καὶ τοιού- των οὕτως μεμαρτυρημένων τὸ ταπεινόφρονον καὶ τὸ ὑποδεές διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς*. Here we have verbal contact with Heb. 12.1, itself strengthened by the fact that these words introduce a conclusion which is drawn following the citation of a number of examples of faith and obedience as in Hebrews (some of which allude to Heb. 11.37). After thus calling attention to the examples, Clement exhorts *ἐπαναδράμωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν ... τῆς εἰρήνης σκοπόν*, which may be regarded as the equivalent of : *τρέχωμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα* (Heb. 12.1). Clement has here evidently adapted the exhortation of Hebrews to suit his own purposes of restoring peace and order in the strife-torn church of Corinth. The identical sequence of thoughts continues in Clement's *ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸν πατέρα κτλ*, paralleling the words of Heb. 12.2 : *ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν*. Clement, however, after again exhorting his readers to peace, expands this call to "look away", employing the successive verbs *ἴδωμεν*, *ἐμβλέψωμεν*, and *νοήσωμεν*. It is very probable that Clement here alludes to the opening words of Heb. 12.

A pattern similar to that of Heb. 12.1f. is also found in Cl. 63.1. There we have the sequence of examples : *τοῖς τοιούτοις καὶ τοσούτοις ὑποδείγμασιν*; and exhortation (but in the form of a *ὅπως* clause) : *ἐπὶ τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ σκοπόν δίχα παντὸς μώμου καταντήσωμεν*. While the third element (the idea of "looking" or "gazing" for inspiration) is absent, the words *τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν* agree exactly with those in Heb. 12.1 Thus the possibility exists that Clement here also alludes to the same passage.¹

One further passage in Clement (chapter 7) may partially betray

¹ Lightfoot mentions this as a possibility. I, 2, 185.

the pattern of Heb. 12.1f. Again following the citation of examples (chapters 4-6), Clement prefaces his exhortation with these words (7.1): ἐν γὰρ τῷ αὐτῷ ἐσμὲν σκάμματι, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ἀγὼν ἐπικείται. The similarity with the words of Heb. 12.1, τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγὼνα is clear. Clement continues (7.2): διὸ ἀπολίπωμεν τὰς κενὰς καὶ ματαίας φροντίδας, words which again seem reminiscent of Heb. 12.1, although not forming one of the components of our pattern: ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα καὶ τὴν ἐνπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν. The exhortation proper is given as follows in Clement: ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐκλεῆ καὶ σεμνὸν τῆς παραδόσεως ἡμῶν κανόνα. If, as Lightfoot suggests, κανὼν is "the measure of the leap or the race assigned to the athlete",¹ Clement's exhortation is closely related to the exhortation in Hebrews: τρέχωμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγὼνα. The third component of the pattern ("looking" as a means of inspiration) is present in the following hortative verbs: (7.3) ἴδωμεν; (7.4) ἀτενίσωμεν, γνῶμεν.²

Finally, as possible allusions to the ἀποθέμενοι of Heb. 12.1, we may mention the presence of the identical word used in the same manner, in Cl. 13.1 and 57.2.

Allusions to Heb. 12, however, are not confined to the first two verses. The words of Cl. 56.2: ἀναλάβωμεν παιδείαν, ἐφ' ἧ οὐδεὶς ὀφείλει ἀγανακτεῖν, ἀγαπητοί, are probably to be regarded as an allusion to Heb. 12.7f.: εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε · ὡς υἱοῖς ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ θεός κτλ. Such a surmise is somewhat confirmed because of the fact that Clement in verse 4 quotes Pr. 3.12, a verse which the writer to the Hebrews also cites in 12.6. Both citations agree verbatim with the LXX text.³ Further contact is to be seen in the concluding words of Cl. 56: πατὴρ γὰρ ἀγαθὸς ὢν παιδεύει εἰς τὸ ἐλεθθῆναι ἡμᾶς διὰ τῆς ὁσίας παιδείας αὐτοῦ. Heb. 12.7 is reflected here, but as well, the thought that chastisement is profitable: ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἀγιότητος αὐτοῦ (12.10), and: καρπὸν εἰρηνικὸν τοῖς δι' αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις ἀποδίδωσιν δικαιοσύνης (12.11). While there is not identity of thought here, there is, in the light of the whole, a substantial parallelism.

Among other possible allusions to Heb. 12, may be mentioned the

¹ I, 2, 36. Clement of Alexandria quotes the words of his Roman namesake concerning κανὼν and in the same context refers to ἀγὼν. (*Stromata* I, 15, 3).

² These latter two verbs, though forming a part of the pattern of Heb. 12.1f., serve also to introduce an allusion to 1 Peter. See p. 239.

³ A and R. The text of B, however, has ἐλέγχει for παιδεύει.

similarity of ideas in Heb. 12.23 : ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς (cf. the same idea in Lk. 10.20) and Cl. 45.8 : ἔγγραφοι ἐγένοντο ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ μνημοσύνῳ αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων; and the occurrence of the phrase μετανοίας τόπον in Cl. 7.5 and Heb. 12.17. One further possibility is that Clement's ὁ παντεπόπτης θεὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ κύριος πάσης σαρκός (64.1) reflects τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων of Heb. 12.9. Clement's language, however, more closely follows that of Nu. 16.22 (LXX), and is therefore probably directly dependent upon Numbers, which also provides the source of the terminology in Hebrews.¹

Clement's epistle does not lack allusions to other parts of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There is a probable allusion in the words of 21.9, ἐρευνητὴς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐννοιῶν καὶ ἐνθυμήσεων to those of Heb. 4.12, καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας. Although in Clement the subject of these words is God rather than ὁ λόγος as in Hebrews, the substantial agreement in phraseology makes an allusion at this point fairly certain.²

Another very probable allusion is to be found in Cl. 27.2 : ὁ παραγγείλας μὴ ψεύδεσθαι, πολλῷ μᾶλλον αὐτὸς οὐ ψεύσεται · οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀδύνατον παρὰ τῷ θεῷ εἰ μὴ τὸ ψεύσασθαι. This appears to be a restatement or paraphrase of what is stated positively in Heb. 6.18 : ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι θεόν. In both places the words are used to establish God's faithfulness to his promises.

The allusions to Heb. 1 which are found in Cl. 36 have already been discussed. A further possible allusion to the same chapter may be found in 27.4 where the words, ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα, probably reflect those of Heb. 1.3 : φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. Although there is little similarity in the actual wording, the conception is remarkably parallel,

¹ The attempt made by Nairne (*op. cit.*, p. xxxii, cf. p. 127) to find an allusion to the word *δέους* (a hapax legomenon in the NT) of Heb. 12.28 in Cl. 2.4 is based on the acceptance on the inferior reading *δέους* which is found only in Codex C. A and all the versions witness that the true reading is *ἐλέους*. The problem of Lightfoot (I, 2, 18), who accepted the reading *δέους*, is successfully answered by Knopf who predicates both *ἐλέους* and *συνειδήσεως* of the Corinthians themselves. *Die Apostolischen Väter*, HZNT, I, 46.

² Philo, in commenting on the phrase "he divided them in the middle" (Gn. 15.10), refers to τῷ τομῇ τῶν συμπάντων ἑαυτοῦ λόγῳ, ὃς εἰς τὴν ὀξυτάτην ἀκμὴν διαίρων οὐδέποτε λήγει which metaphor he applies not merely to material things but to τὰ λόγῳ θεωρητά. *Quis. Her.* 130f. Whatever relationship may exist between the text of Hebrews and Philo, Clement's dependence on Hebrews can hardly be questioned.

with the minor difference that in Clement the words refer apparently to God, whereas in Hebrews they refer to Christ.

In two places where Clement alludes to the description of Moses in Nu. 12.7 (ὁ θεράπων μου Μωϋσῆς · ἐν ὧ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός ἐστιν), he may have been influenced by passages in Heb. 3. Thus in 17.5 Clement writes : Μωϋσῆς πιστός ἐν ὧ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ἐκλήθη, with which may be compared Heb. 3.2 : Ἰησοῦν, πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν [ὧ] τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.¹ A significant agreement of Clement with Hebrews, is the pronoun αὐτοῦ, against the LXX's μου. If Clement is in fact alluding to Heb. 3.2, we might have evidence that the disputed ὧ was in Clement's MS of Hebrews. This cannot be certain, however, since just a few lines later in 3.5 the writer to the Hebrews again refers to Moses, this time undisputedly employing the adjective ὧ : καὶ Μωϋσῆς μὲν πιστός ἐν ὧ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ὡς θεράπων. Clement could easily have borrowed the ὧ from this passage, or unconsciously have recalled it from the Numbers passage. He may allude to Heb. 3.5 in 43.1 : ὁ μακάριος πιστός θεράπων ἐν ὧ τῷ οἴκῳ Μωϋσῆς.² In this instance, however, we have neither the αὐτοῦ of Hebrews nor the μου of the LXX. It appears then that in these two places Clement is very possibly dependent upon Heb. 3, or it may be that Clement's reference to the description of Moses in Numbers was suggested by its occurrence in Heb. 3.

A few remaining allusions seem less convincing and are here briefly mentioned as remote possibilities. The reference to Jesus as τὸ σκῆπτρον τῆς μεγαλωσύνης τοῦ θεοῦ in Cl. 16.2 may have been derived from Heb. 1.8, ἡ ράβδος τῆς εὐθύτητος, ράβδος τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ.³ Most importantly the key word is different in both passages, and the interpretation of the Hebrews passage itself laden with difficulty.⁴ Massaux suggested that Clement's exhortation to patience in receiving the promises (35.4) was an allusion to Heb. 10.36.⁵ However, the thought that patience is necessary in awaiting the fulfilment of promises is so common that it makes dependence on Hebrews unneces-

¹ ὧ is omitted in P¹³, P⁴⁶ (marked as probable by Nestle-Aland) and B.

² Clement also refers to Moses as θεράπων in 53.5. There, however, he has just cited the LXX of Dt. 9.12-14 in the context of which the same word is used in referring to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (9.27).

³ Thus Lightfoot I, 2, 57.

⁴ Cf. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 68. Grant describes Clement's phrase as "an expression which sounds biblical but is not". *AF* II, 38.

⁵ *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu*, p. 61.

sary. Massaux's suggested contact between Clement's reference to those who hardened their hearts under Moses (51.3), and the OT citations (from Ps. 95) in Heb. 3.8,15, is in fact too general to draw any conclusions.¹

Nairne suggests the possibility that Clement's words (20.11) τοὺς προσπεφενυγότας τοῖς οἰκτιρμοῖς αὐτοῦ allude to Heb. 6.18, οἱ καταφυγόντες κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος, but the connection here seems tenuous.² The same may be said of Nairne's suggestion that Cl. 20.10, ἀνέμων σταθμοὶ κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον καιρὸν τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν ἀπροσκόπως ἐπιτελοῦσιν may be related to the juxtaposition of πνεύματα and λειτουργοὺς / λειτουργικά in Heb. 1.7,14.³ In this passage Clement seems more to be dependent upon Stoic conceptions of the regularity and order of the universe.⁴ The mention of ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἣ βλαστήσασα in Heb. 9.4 may conceivably have given rise to the account of the budding of Aaron's rod given in Cl. 43, but this is by no means certain. Another intriguing possibility is that Clement's οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν εὐηγγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (42.1), refers to the mention in Heb. 2.3 of the initial declaration of salvation by the Lord. Clement continues by stating that Jesus was sent (ἐξεπέμφθη) by God, with which may be compared the reference to Jesus as τὸν ἀπόστολον in Heb. 3.1.

Lightfoot has suggested that Clement's famous explanation of Rahab's scarlet cord as a type of the blood of Jesus (12.7) may perhaps have come to him through the words of Heb. 9.19, λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τῶν τράγων μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου καὶ ὑσσώπου. Interesting though this suggestion is, it must remain in the realm of conjecture.

Supposed allusions based solely on one word are as a rule not very convincing. The following are representative: πρόδηλον in Cl. 11.1 and Heb. 7.14; ἑτεροκλινεῖς in Cl. 11.1 with ἀκλινῇ in Heb. 10.23; χαρακτῆρα in Cl. 33.4 with χαρακτήρ in Heb. 1.3; μετόχους in Cl. 34.7 and Heb. 6.4; μέτοχοι in Heb. 3.1,14; and σύγκρασις in Cl. 37.4 with συγκεκρασμένος in Heb. 4.2. Somewhat more convincing, however, are the words εὐάρεστα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ found in Cl. 21.1 and τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ in Heb. 13.21. Also to be noticed is the use of μαρτυρέω in Cl. 17.1,2; 18.1; 19.1 and in Heb. 11.2,4,5,39.

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Op. cit.*, p. xxxi.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ See L. Sanders, *L'Hellénisme de Saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme*, p. 108ff.

Perhaps the most convincing of these possibilities, however, is the occurrence of one of Clement's favourite words *φιλοξενία* in Heb. 13.2: *τῆς φιλοξενίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε · διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες ἀγγέλους*. In Clement the word is found in 1.2; 10.7; 11.1; and 12.1 (cf. *φιλόξενος*, 12.3; *ἀφιλοξενία*, 35.5). Especially interesting is the use of the word in describing Abraham, who was given a son (10.7) and Lot, who was saved from Sodom (11.1). In each respective instance, Abraham (Gn. 18) and Lot (Gn. 19) by their hospitality had unknowingly entertained angels. It would seem then that here are further examples of Clement's pleasure in identifying personages alluded to but unnamed by the writer to the Hebrews. Along with his stress upon *φιλοξενία* as a virtue neglected by the Corinthian Church,¹ Clement takes up the word *φιλαδελφία* (47.5; 48.1)—a word found also in Heb. 13.1: *ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέτω*. Obedience to leaders (*ἡγούμενοι* 1.3; 60.4; cf. 37.2f.) is another theme germane to Clement's purpose that is also found in Hebrews (13.7,17).

Finally, the introductory formulae employed by Clement may in several places betray influence of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Thus when Clement introduces an OT citation with the words *λέγει γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον* (13.1), and *καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐλάλησεν* (16.2) with no mention of the human source of the citation, he may be borrowing a device employed in Heb. 3.7 (*καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*) and 10.15 (*μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*).² Further similarities can be seen in the frequent use of indeterminate formulae, and particularly the use of the adverb *πού*, which in the whole of the NT is thus used only in Hebrews (2.6; 4.4).³

No list of possible allusions can ever be exhaustive, and lists which are unduly extended often testify more to the compiler's ingenuity than to genuine contact between two written documents. A longer list of allusions is perhaps more justifiable when one writer can be shown to have used the writing of another. Such we judge to be the present case. In Cl. 36 and Cl. 9-12 it can hardly be questioned but

¹ Cf. Lightfoot I, 2, 45 and 109.

² Cf. Heb. 9.8. There are instances in the NT, such as Mk. 12.36 and Mt. 22.43 where OT words are cited as having been spoken by men through the agency of the Holy Spirit (cf. Cl. 8.1; 22.1). In Acts 1.16 and 28.35 it is the Holy Spirit who speaks through the agency of David and Isaiah, while Acts 4.25 interestingly combines the agency of David and the Holy Spirit. Only in Hebrews, however, is the Holy Spirit said to be the author of OT words with no reference to the human agency.

³ See above, pp. 29, 31.

that Clement has made use of the Epistle to the Hebrews. This being so, greater weight is added to a number of allusions which taken by themselves appear somewhat tenuous—i.e. the argument is cumulative. Thus the allusions to chapters 11 and 12 of Hebrews seem particularly convincing. At the same time, however, care must be taken to allow for the existence of terminology common in the early Church,¹ a terminology common to the first century, and agreement which may in fact be purely fortuitous.

It seems certain then that Clement read, loved, was taught by, and made use of, the Epistle to the Hebrews in writing his pastoral letter to the Church at Corinth.² In an attempt to account for the extensive use made of Hebrews by Clement, E. J. Goodspeed suggested that Clement was stimulated to write his epistle by the word of rebuke which he read in Heb. 5.12: καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ

¹ The majority of Nairne's suggested liturgical contacts between Clement and Hebrews would seem to fall into this category. If by "liturgical affinities" is simply meant that Clement and Hebrews both employ the language of worship, there can be no objection. But if one means to say that Clement in these places is dependent upon Hebrews, or that both Clement and Hebrews are dependent upon a Roman liturgy (a conjecture which Nairne ventures to make), it must be objected that in the last analysis the evidence is insufficient. The following is a list of the liturgical contacts between Clement and Hebrews suggested by Nairne: Cl. 29.1 = Heb. 10.22; 30.1 = 12.14 (μερίς, 2.11; 3.1, 14); 31.1 = 4.2 (μὴ συγκεκρασμένους κτλ); 34.5 (ἄγγελοι) = 12.22; 34.7 (συναχθέντες) = 10.25; 34.7 (συνειδήσει) = 9.9, 14 (10.2, 22; 13.18); 34.7 (ἐκτεινῶς) = the idea behind Heb. 5.7-10; 35.12 (θυσία αἰνέσεως [a citation of the LXX, and not Clement's words]) = 13.15; [equivalents not specified] = 13.16 (ευποιίας καὶ κοινωνίας); 36.1 (αὕτη ἡ δόξ) = 10.20; 60.1 = 11.3. *Op. cit.*, p. xxxvf. Knoch also speaks of Clement's use of liturgical tradition. *Eigenart und Bedeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufriss des ersten Clemensbriefes*, p. 89ff.

² It should be pointed out that Beyschlag questions Clement's dependence on Hebrews. In a general discussion of the NT in Clement he writes "Sieht man einmal von der sicheren Benutzung der Paulusbriefe (d. h. mindestens Rm und I Kor) ab, so sind tatsächlich alle sonstigen, scheinbar literarischen Abhängigkeiten und Anklänge—Hebr eingeschlossen!—grundsätzlich mit einem Fragezeichen zu versehen". *Clemens Romanus und der Frühkatholizismus*, p. 29. In keeping with the main thesis of his book, Beyschlag favours seeing a common *Gemeindetradition* behind Clement and Hebrews. He points to W. Wrede and P. Drews as supporting this viewpoint (p. 30, n. 1). This is slightly misleading, however, since Drews, arguing a thesis not dissimilar to Beyschlag's, merely follows Wrede in regarding chapters 9-12 of Clement's epistle as derived from tradition. *Op. cit.*, p. 23ff. It is clear that Wrede spoke only of chapters 9-12 since he writes "Die Abhängigkeit im Allgemeinen leugnen wir nicht. Klemens hat den Hebräerbrief wohl gekannt, benutzt und gewiss hoch geschätzt". *Op. cit.*, p. 72.

τὸν χρόνον, πάλιν χρεῖαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινα τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ.¹ Goodspeed wrote :

Something more than mere recentness is necessary to explain the great mass of reminiscence of Hebrews in 1 Clement, especially in Rome, where for nearly three centuries thereafter Hebrews is little noticed. But if Hebrews has just been received, and 1 Clement is written under the spur of its challenge, this frequent reflection of its language and method is only natural.²

This conjecture is interesting, but unnecessary since we do have more than "mere recentness" in explaining Clement's use of Hebrews. Clement, faced with the need of writing to the Corinthian Church, found in the Epistle to the Hebrews a veritable mine of ideas and phraseology which were found to be not only convincing in themselves, but which seemed ready-made for, or perfectly adaptable to, his own purposes.

B. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS

It is not surprising that the NT writing best attested in Clement's epistle is Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. Not only did both epistles have the same destination, but both were written for the same purpose : to restore order and unity to a strife-torn church. It is therefore easily understandable that Clement often alludes to, and indeed makes explicit reference to the Apostle's letter which the Corinthian Church had received probably a mere forty years earlier.

Of the various NT writings used by Clement, only this one is assigned an author (47.1) : ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Clement continues : τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν ; ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπολλῶ, διὰ τὸ καὶ τότε προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι. It is certain that Clement here refers to 1 Cor. 1.10ff., for not only is Paul stated to be the author of the epistle, but Clement also adds that it is the first thing about which Paul wrote "in the beginning of the gospel". Whether by ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is meant the beginning of Paul's epistle or the earliest days of the Corinthian Church, when the gospel was first preached to them (as

¹ "First Clement Called Forth By Hebrews", *JBL* 30 (1911), 157-160. Found also in *New Solutions of NT Problems* (Chicago, 1927), pp. 110-115.

² *Ibid.*, p. 159.

seems more probable, cf. Phil. 4.15, and 1 Cor. 4.15),¹ the first thing (*πρῶτον*) that Paul wrote about 1 Corinthians after the customary salutation and thanksgiving, was the party-spirit that had become rampant at Corinth. Although there is no contact in the actual wording of the two passages (Clement's *προσκλίσεις* is, however, comparable to *ἔριδες* of 1 Cor. 1.11), Clement refers to three of the four parties mentioned in 1 Cor. 1.12, only naming Cephas before Apollos and omitting reference to the Christ-party.² Massaux has pointed out that Clement's *πνευματικῶς* is particularly significant in describing a letter in which the Spirit is so prominent (see e.g. 1 Cor. 2).³

There is also a strong similarity in the opening words of the two epistles which suggests that Clement had 1 Corinthians in his mind when he wrote. Clement begins: *ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον, κλητοῖς ἡγιασμένοις ἐν θελήματι θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ παντοκράτορος θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληθυνθείη*. Of all Paul's salutations, only in the two addressed to Corinth does he employ the words *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ*. Moreover, only in the salutation of 1 Corinthians is the word *ἡγιασμένοις* found, exactly agreeing with Clement's word. The word *κλητοῖς* is found only in the salutation of 1 Corinthians and Romans (in both places, however, it is combined with *ἀγίοις*). The formula *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ* is found in the majority of the Pauline epistles (including 1 Corinthians) where, however, it is extended by the words *καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* rather than *διὰ κτλ.* as in Clement.⁴ Clement's *πληθυνθείη* is found only in 1 and 2 Peter and Jude. Although it is dangerous to draw conclusions from epistolary salutations, which after all were based on a commonly accepted pattern, the peculiar similarities between Clement and 1 Corinthians at this point do seem striking.

¹ For a third possible meaning of *εὐαγγέλιον* in this passage, see below, p. 332.

² In the two other places in 1 Corinthians where the names championed by the various parties are mentioned (3.4; 3.22), no reference is made to Christ. And in 3.4 only Paul and Apollos are mentioned. Clement's reference to Cephas constitutes the only reference to that name in the Apostolic Fathers.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

⁴ In addition to its several NT occurrences in Revelation, Clement's *παντοκράτορος* is elsewhere found only in 2 Cor. 6.18 where it is probably an allusion to the LXX of 2 Sa. 7.8. This word, which is common in the LXX (see especially Zechariah), is a favourite of Clement (see 2.3; 32.4; 60.4 : 62.2; cf. 8.5).

There are several probable allusions in Clement to the early chapters of 1 Corinthians. In the words of 40.1 *προδήλων οὖν ἡμῖν ὄντων τούτων, καὶ ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως*, Clement may allude to 1 Cor. 2.10: *ἡμῖν γὰρ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος · τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα πάντα ἐρευνᾷ καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ*. In both passages we have not only *τὰ βάθη*, but also the similar words *ἀπεκάλυψεν* and *προδήλων* (cf. also *ἐρευνᾷ* with *ἐγκεκυφότες*). In 7.1 Clement's words: *ταῦτα, ἀγαπητοί, οὐ μόνον ὑμᾶς νουθετοῦντες ἐπιστέλλομεν* may well be a reminiscence of Paul's words in 1 Cor. 4.14: *οὐκ ἐντρέπων ὑμᾶς γράφω ταῦτα, ἀλλ' ὡς τέκνα μου ἀγαπητὰ νουθετῶν*. The parallels between *νουθετῶν* and *νουθετοῦντες*, *ἀγαπητά* and *ἀγαπητοί*, and *γράφω* and *ἐπιστέλλομεν*, are impressive. In 34.2 Clement's words *ἐξ αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐστὶν τὰ πάντα* are probably an echo of 1 Cor. 8.6 *ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα* (the same thought, however, is also found in Rom. 11.36).

Far more convincing, however, are Clement's allusions to chapters 12, 13, and 15 of 1 Corinthians. In his forceful exhortation for the restoration of unity and order in the Corinthian Church, Clement found the perfect argument in 1 Cor. 12. Although he freely makes use of Paul's words without acknowledgement, there can be no question but that his readers were immediately aware of the source of his analogy. Clement's passage amounts to a paraphrase of 1 Cor. 12.12-27, but the most direct parallels are the following.

Clement 37.5; 38.1

(Text of A)

λάβωμεν τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν ·
ἢ κεφαλὴ δίσχα τῶν ποδῶν οὐδέν ἐστιν,
οὕτως οὐδὲ οἱ πόδες δίσχα τῆς κεφαλῆς ·
τὰ δὲ ἐλάχιστα μέλη τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν
ἀναγκαῖα καὶ εὐχρηστά ἐστὶν ὅλῳ τῷ σώματι ·

ἀλλὰ πάντα συνπνεῖ καὶ ὑποταγῇ μιᾷ χρηταί
εἰς τὸ σώζεσθαι ὅλον τὸ σῶμα.
σώζεσθαι οὖν ἡμῶν ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐν Χριστῷ
Ἰησοῦ,

καὶ ὑποτασέσθω ἕκαστος τῷ πλησίον
αὐτοῦ, καθὼς ἐτέθη ἐν τῷ χαρίσματι αὐτοῦ.

1 Corinthians 12

(Text of Nestle-Aland)

20, νῦν δὲ πολλὰ μὲν μέλη, ἐν δὲ σῶμα.
21, οὐ δύναται ... ἢ κεφαλὴ[εἰπὲν] τοῖς ποσίν ·
χρεῖαν ὑμῶν οὐκ ἔχω ·
22, ἀλλὰ πολλῶ μᾶλλον τὰ δοκοῦντα μέλη
τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενέστερα ὑπάρχειν ἀναγκαῖα
ἐστίν,
24, ἀλλὰ ὁ θεὸς συνεκέρασεν τὸ σῶμα ...
25, ἵνα μὴ ᾖ σχίσμα ἐν τῷ σώματι,

ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων μεριμνῶσιν τὰ μέλη.
28, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κτλ.

Although Paul also used the metaphor of the body and its members in Rom. 12.4f. (an epistle which Clement certainly knew) and Eph. 5.30ff., the detailed succession of parallels makes it virtually certain that Clement here depends on 1 Corinthians. Only in the latter is the

metaphor elaborated so that mention is made of "the head" and "the feet" and of the necessity and importance of the "weaker" member. It is interesting to note that Clement's reference to *χάρισμα* in connection with this metaphor reflects the same connection in 1 Corinthians (and Romans). The occurrence of the word in 38.1 is similar to Paul's use of it in 1 Cor. 12.4: *διαίρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶν, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα*. Clement's repeated *ὅλον τὸ σῶμα* is found in 1 Cor. 12.17; and with Clement's *συνπνεῖ* should be compared *σμπάσχει* and *συγχαίρει* of 1 Cor. 12.26. Further, among the words in Clement which occur immediately before the passage under discussion, *σύγκρασις* may be related to *συνεκέρασεν* in 1 Cor. 12.24, and *χρήσις* may be compared with the two occurrences of *χρείαν* in 1 Cor. 12.21.

With these rather conspicuous parallels in mind, it is difficult to understand Sanders' contention that "la dépendance est plutôt éloignée, relative à l'idée seulement".¹ These words appear more appropriately to apply to the parallels which Sanders has culled from the literature of Stoicism; certainly they are not as exact and as detailed as those from 1 Corinthians. Sanders' point, however, is well made: the metaphor of the body and its members was in widespread use, and Clement's application of the metaphor is at this point more similar to the Stoic than to the Pauline usage.² Nevertheless in the light of Clement's admitted knowledge of 1 Corinthians, the striking parallels and Sanders' own admission that the metaphor was suggested to Clement by Paul,³ assuredly it is more correct to say that Clement has borrowed from 1 Corinthians and has adapted the material to suit his own purpose (which happened to coincide with, and was perhaps strengthened by, the Stoic application of the metaphor) than to say that he was dependent upon some Stoic source which he then coloured with Pauline allusions. It is difficult not to conclude that in this passage Clement is clearly dependent upon 1 Cor. 12.

This conclusion is strengthened inasmuch as Clement seems to give

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 82.

² For the Stoics the gift of each member of the body is simply for the purpose of rendering good to one's neighbour. Paul is concerned with the gift as a spiritual contribution to the body. (Sanders, p. 81f.). An absolute contrast however is unwarranted since Paul is equally concerned with the rendering of good to the other members of the body. See 1 Cor. 12.25f. For the use of the metaphor in Hellenistic literature, see H. Lietzmann, *An Die Korinther I/II*, HZNT (Tübingen, 1949), 62f. Knoch also points to the Hellenistic influence in the passage. *Op. cit.*, p. 83.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

indication elsewhere of his dependence upon 1 Cor. 12. Thus probably to be related to this same passage in 1 Cor. 12 are Clement's words in 46.7: *ἵνατί διέλκομεν καὶ διασπῶμεν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ στασιάζομεν πρὸς τὸ σῶμα ἴδιον ... ὅτι μέλη ἐσμέν ἀλλήλων*. The first of these words are similar to those of 1 Cor. 12.27: *ὁμοῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους*. However, the exact phrase *μέλη Χριστοῦ* occurs in 1 Cor. 6.15, and may be echoed here. The last words of Clement may be compared with the *ἀλλήλων μεριμνῶσιν τὰ μέλη* of 1 Cor. 12.25. Although here again a more precise parallel is perhaps found in the *ἀλλήλων μέλη* of Rom. 12.5.

Further, there is a possible contact which may be found in Clement's rhetoric (in the context of the metaphor of the body and its members) in 37.3: *οὐ πάντες εἰσὶν ἑπαρχοὶ οὐδὲ χιλιάρχοι οὐδὲ ἑκατόνταρχοι κτλ*, with which may be compared 1 Cor. 12.29: *μὴ πάντες ἀπόστολοι; μὴ πάντες προφῆται; μὴ πάντες διδασκαλοὶ; κτλ*. More convincing, however, is the allusion to 1 Cor. 12.8ff. in 48.5: *ἦτω τις πιστός, ἦτω δυνατὸς γινώσκειν, ἦτω σοφὸς ἐν διακρίσει λόγων, ἦτω ἄγνός ἐν ἔργοις*.¹ The same traits mentioned by Clement are found in Paul's words (1 Cor. 12.8-10): *ᾧ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος δίδοται λόγος σοφίας, ἄλλῳ δὲ λόγος γνώσεως κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, ἑτέρῳ πίστις ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι, ἄλλῳ δὲ χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ πνεύματι, ἄλλῳ δὲ ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων, κτλ*. Paul continues listing gifts, mentioning a total of nine, but it is significant that Clement mentions the first three of this list. Clement reverses the order of these gifts, but the parallelism is unmistakable. Thus Paul's *λόγος σοφίας* is found in Clement's *σοφὸς ἐν διακρίσει λόγων*; *λόγος γνώσεως* in Clement's *δυνατὸς γινώσκειν*; and *πίστις* in Clement's *πιστός*. Clement's fourth trait *ἄγνός ἐν ἔργοις* may possibly summarize the remaining gifts which Paul speaks of, e.g. *χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων*.² The fact that Clement refers to these gifts in a context

¹ Although all the MS evidence (including all the versions) favours the reading *ἄγνός ἐν ἔργοις*, this passage is twice explicitly quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* I, 38, 8 and VI, 65, 3) and in both places the reading is *γοργός ἐν ἔργοις*. The second of these quotations does not stop with *γοργός ἐν ἔργοις*, but adds *ἦτω ἄγνός*, continuing with a verbatim citation of Clement's next sentence. As a result, Lightfoot felt compelled to adopt the reading *γοργός ἐν ἔργοις, ἦτω ἄγνός* despite the witness of A, C, and the Syriac. Whether the additional testimony of the Latin and Coptic versions would have changed his mind is debatable.

² This becomes more probable if Clement wrote *γοργός ἐν ἔργοις* (see preceding note). Ziegler suggests 2 Cor. 7.11, *ἀγνοῦς ... [ἐν] τῷ πράγματι*, as a parallel to Clement's *ἄγνός ἐν ἔργοις*. *Neue Studien zum ersten Klemensbrief* (München, 1958), p. 55.

concerned with humility and the common good of all, adds to the probability that he is alluding to 1 Cor 12 (cf. Clement's τὸ κοινωφελὲς πᾶσιν [48.6] with the πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον of 1 Cor. 12.7).

1 Cor. 13 clearly shows through in Clement's eulogy on love in chapter 49.

Clement 49.5

(Text of A)

ἀγάπη πάντα ἀνέχεται,
πάντα μακροθυμεῖ ·
οὐδὲν βάνουσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ,
οὐδὲν ὑπερήφανον ·
ἀγάπη σχίσμα οὐκ ἔχει,
ἀγάπη οὐ στασιάζει,
ἀγάπη πάντα ποιεῖ ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ·
ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐτλειώθησαν
πάντες οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ

δίχα ἀγάπης οὐδὲν εὐάρεστον ἐστὶν τῷ θεῷ.

1 Corinthians 13

(Text of Nestle-Aland)

7, πάντα στέγει ... πάντα ὑπομένει
4, ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ
6, οὐ χαίρει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ
4, οὐ περπερεύεται, οὐ φυσιοῦται
5, οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς,
οὐ παροξύνεται,
οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν
[10, ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον]
cf. 1 Jn. 4.18

? (= Heb. 11.6)

In addition to the general similarity of the chapters in form and content, the more specific parallels listed above are impressive. Clement has indeed put his own stamp on the passage in agreement with his theme (cf. the words σχίσμα, στασιάζω, and ὁμόνοια), but it cannot be questioned that he is dependent upon Paul.¹ The Corinthian readers would immediately have recognized the allusion, and noted its suitability to Clement's purpose. Clement's last line may possibly hint at Heb. 11.6: χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαρεσθῆσαι [τῷ θεῷ], with the substitution of ἀγάπης for πίστεως. Clement's conclusion in 50.1: ὁράτε, ἀγαπητοί, πῶς μέγα καὶ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη, καὶ τῆς τελειότητος αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξήγησις, bears a certain similarity to Paul's triumphant words in 1 Cor. 13.13: νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη, τὰ τρία ταῦτα · μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη (Cf. Clement's τελειότητος with τὸ τέλειον in 1 Cor. 13.10).

Sanders again has pointed out that Clement's chapters on love (49-50) are influenced by Pythagorean and Stoic themes,² but this may be granted while yet recognizing, as Sanders does, that Clement still shows dependence upon 1 Cor. 13.

Chapter 15 of 1 Corinthians is also clearly used by Clement in his epistle.

¹ Clement of Alexandria paraphrases this passage from the Roman Clement (*Stromata* IV, 111, 3), and then quotes Paul's words (αὐτίκα ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος) in 1 Cor. 13.3,1.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 93-108.

In 24.1 Clement writes: *κατανοήσωμεν, ἀγαπητοί, πῶς ὁ δεσπότης ἐπιδείκνυται διηνεκῶς ἡμῖν τὴν μέλλουσαν ἀνάστασιν ἔσεσθαι, ἥς τὴν ἀπαρχὴν ἐποιήσατο τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήσας*. These words clearly indicate dependence upon 1 Cor. 15.20: *νυνὶ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων* (cf. *ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός* in 15.23). Of its NT occurrences, *ἀπαρχή* is used with reference to the resurrection only in 1 Cor. 15 where its application to Christ, as a promise of a future resurrection, is exactly the same as in Clement. Further on in the same chapter (24.5) Clement has interestingly combined the language of the synoptic Parable of the Sower with that of Paul where he applies the "sowing" metaphor to the resurrection (1 Cor. 15.36ff.). The relevant words in 1 Corinthians are: *ὁ σπείρεις, οὐ ζωοποιεῖται ἐὰν μὴ ἀποθάνῃ · καὶ ὁ σπείρεις, οὐ τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον σπείρεις, ἀλλὰ γυμνὸν κόκκον εἰ τύχοι σίτου ἢ τινος τῶν λοιπῶν*. (For Clement's text, see p. 164, where it is discussed as an allusion to the Synoptic tradition.) The parallels between Clement and 1 Cor. 15 are as follows:

Clement 24.5

*ὁ σπείρων
γυμνά
διαλύεται
ἀνίστησιν*

1 Corinthians 15

*36, 37, ὁ σπείρεις
37 γυμνὸν κόκκον
36 ἀποθάνῃ
36 ζωοποιεῖται*

Clement employs the metaphor simply as a demonstration of the fact of the resurrection, while Paul uses it to illustrate the difference between the pre-resurrection and post-resurrection body. But despite this difference in application, the parallel imagery and especially its proximity to Clement's reference to Christ as the *ἀπαρχή* of the resurrection make it quite certain that Clement here also alludes to 1 Cor. 15. In the larger context—especially the illustrations of the alternation of night and day, the seasons, and the Phoenix—Clement shows contact with Hellenistic sources,¹ but this in no way lessens the certainty of Clement's dependence upon 1 Cor. 15.

A further allusion to 1 Cor. 15 is probably to be found in Cl. 37.3: *ἀλλ' ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι* and 41.1: *ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι εὐαριστέω τῷ θεῷ*, with which may be compared 1 Cor. 15.23: *ἕκαστος δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι*. Indeed, in 37.3 these words are

¹ See Sanders, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-74. Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

found in Clement following a listing of military offices¹ not unlike Paul's listing of gifts in 1 Cor. 12.28ff. In 41.1 they follow a reference to the orders appointed in the OT for the proper worship of God. In 1 Cor. 15, however, the words refer to the order of resurrection: first Christ, then those who belong to him. Nevertheless it seems probable that Clement unconsciously alludes to 1 Cor. 15, although with the Oxford Committee, it must be allowed that the phrase is general enough that it could naturally arise from the context.²

Somewhat less convincing is Clement's witness to 1 Cor. 16. There are two possible allusions here. Clement may allude to 1 Cor. 16.15 in 42.4: *κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν*. Speaking of the household of Stephanas, Paul writes (1 Cor. 16.15): *ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας καὶ εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς*. Clement's use of *ἀπαρχή* in referring to initial converts is the same as Paul's use of the word (see also Rom. 16.5). Similarly, Clement's *εἰς ... διακόνους* may reflect Paul's *εἰς διακονίαν* and it is the combination of this word with *ἀπαρχή* that makes the possibility of an allusion worth considering. A second possible allusion is to be seen in Clement's words of 38.2: *ὁ δὲ πτωχὸς εὐχαριστεῖτω τῷ θεῷ, ὅτι ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ, δι' οὗ ἀναπληρωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὸ ὑστέρημα*. The last clause is comparable to Paul's gratitude for Stephanas, Fortunatus,³ and Achaicus in 1 Cor. 16.17: *ὅτι τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑστέρημα οὗτοι ἀνεπλήρωσαν*. The combination of *ἀναπληρώω* (or a similar compound of *πληρώω*) and *ὑστέρημα*, however, is a common one in Paul (cf. Phil. 2.30; Col. 1.24; 2 Cor. 9.12 and 11.9), and it can only be guessed whether Clement is in fact dependent on Paul. The request to send back a messenger in peace—Cl. 65.1: *ἐν εἰρήνῃ μετὰ χαρᾶς ἐν τάχει ἀναπέμψατε πρὸς ἡμᾶς*; 1 Cor. 16.11:

¹ Grant argues convincingly that the military offices mentioned reflect Jewish precedents and not the Roman army as commonly alleged. *AF* II, 65. The argument for a Jewish background has been fully expounded by A. Jaubert, "Les Sources de la Conception Militaire de l'Église en 1 Clément 37", *VC* 18 (1964), 74-84. Jaubert does not minimize Hellenistic influences in the passage, but finds that Clement also is dependent upon the military theme of the combat of God and his people against his adversaries which is found in the late Jewish writings (particularly at Qumran).

² *NTAF*, p. 44.

³ Lightfoot finds "no improbability" in identifying Clement's Fortunatus (65.1) with the Fortunatus of 1 Cor. 16.17, but cautions that it was a very common name. I, 2, 187.

προπέμψατε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν εἰρήνῃ—would seem too natural to constitute an allusion.

In two of his OT citations, Clement appears to have been influenced by 1 Corinthians. In 13.1 Clement writes :

λέγει γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον · μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, μηδὲ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτοῦ, μηδὲ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἡ ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω, τοῦ ἐκζητεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην.

This citation appears to have been taken from the LXX of Je. 9.23f. or 1 Sa. 2.10. Clement agrees closely with both passages, but the last part of the passage departs from both OT texts.¹ Particularly interesting is Clement's agreement with the words of Paul in 1 Cor. 1.31 (also found in 2 Cor. 10.17)² against those of the LXX text :

1 Corinthians 1.31 (= 2 Cor. 10.17)	Clement 13.1	Jeremiah 9.23	1 Reigns 2.10
ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω	ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω, τοῦ ἐκζητεῖν αὐτόν	ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος	ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον

Clement's departure from the LXX and agreement with Paul may be explained in two different ways.³ On the one hand it is possible that lying behind Clement and Paul is a divergent LXX text (whether of Jeremiah or 1 Reigns) or some non-canonical source to which both provide independent witness. On the other hand, it may be that Clement, while citing the LXX, assimilates the words in question to those so familiar to him from the Pauline epistle(s), and is therefore dependent upon 1 Corinthians at this point. The former explanation, which

¹ For a discussion of the OT texts, see p. 59f.

² Clarke is next to unintelligible when he writes "The quotation in 13.1 ('let him that glorieth glory in the Lord') is part of a composite utterance ascribed to the Holy Spirit, so Clement may be quoting the original of 2. Cor. 10.17 rather than St. Paul's version". *Op. cit.*, p. 34. Presumably what is meant is that because the introductory formula of Clement (λέγει γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) differs from that of 1 Corinthians (γέγραπται), it is easier to trace Clement's citation to 2 Corinthians where no introductory formula occurs at all. But Clement's introductory formula refers to the whole of the OT citation and not simply to the words which are also found in Paul.

³ Neither the underlying Hebrew of Jeremiah nor that of 1 Samuel (which is very different from the LXX) helps in solving the problem with which we are confronted.

has had its proponents¹ and must remain a possibility, suffers in the fatal lack of confirmatory evidence. It is certain, however, that Clement knew and made use of 1 Corinthians. Accordingly, the most natural and probable explanation² of Clement's words is that they are the result of the influence of 1 Cor. 1.31. This does not solve the problem of the origin of Paul's words, but they may well result from Paul's own crystallization of the Jeremiah or 1 Reigns text in a way not dissimilar to the Midrash pesher method with which he handles other OT citations.³ Alternatively the words may already have been formulated as a platitude which achieved popularity and which Paul took up for his own purposes.

Similar phenomena are encountered in a second OT citation found in Cl. 34.8 with which we may compare 1 Cor. 2.9. and the LXX of Is. 64.3 and 65.16 :

<i>Clement 34.8</i> (Text of A)	<i>1 Corinthians 2.9</i> (Text of Nestle-Aland)	<i>Isaiah 64.3 [65.16]</i> (Text of Rahlfs)
ὀφθαλμός οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν	ἃ ὀφθαλμός οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν	ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον θεὸν πλήν σου καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου [ἐπιλήσονται γὰρ τὴν θλίψιν αὐτῶν τὴν πρώτην
καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν.	καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.	καὶ οὐκ ἀναβήσεται αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν] ἃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον.

It can be seen that Clement's text is almost identical with that of 1 Corinthians. Codex C has indeed apparently been corrected to agree more exactly with Paul's words. Thus C reads ἃ ὀφθαλμός, and ἡτοίμασε κύριος (both additions supported by the Latin and Syriac versions; the two Coptic MSS being deficient at this point) for ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεός, as well as τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν (supported by Syriac,

¹ Grant fails to acknowledge the possibility of an alternate explanation. *AF* II, 36. Knopf asks whether a lost source may not lie behind the citation. His suggestion of Sir. 10.22 (πλούσιος καὶ ἔνδοξος καὶ πτωχός, τὸ καύχημα αὐτῶν φόβος κυρίου) is interesting as a parallel to the OT citations, but is only very improbably Clement's source. *Op. cit.*, p. 64. Massaux simply affirms that Clement is not dependent on 1 Corinthians. *Op. cit.*, p. 60. Surprisingly, the Oxford Committee in *NTAF* does not mention Cl. 13.1 as a possible allusion to 1 Corinthians.

² Thus Lightfoot I, 2, 51. Cf. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago, 1941), p. 91.

³ See especially E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the OT* (London, 1957).

but Latin has *sustinentibus eum*). However, even with Codex A as the original reading of Clement, the agreement with 1 Cor. 2.9 is conspicuous.

Again we have the same possible alternatives to account for Clement's citation: either he has taken it from 1 Corinthians, or he has taken it from the same source as Paul—a source which remains unknown to us. Among those who argue in favour of the latter hypothesis are the Oxford Committee, who favour an unknown pre-Christian work,¹ and Massaux who prefers Rabbinic tradition,² as the source of Clement's citation. When Grant says that the promise is "either from an apocryphal book or from Isaiah" it is not clear whether he is referring to Clement's or Paul's source, or both.³

Resch compiled a great many parallels to our passage from the literature of the early Church in an attempt to establish a pre-Pauline source for the citation.⁴ He found particularly convincing the parallels in *Apostolic Constitutions* VII, 32 and Clement of Alexandria (*Protrepticus* X, 94) since in these places alone the words compose part of a larger citation. Resch argued that these two citations were independent witnesses to the same source from which Paul derived the saying, contending on the basis of *εὐαγγελίζεται* in the Alexandrian's introductory formula and the reference to the Kingdom of God in the larger context of both citations, that the source was a compendium of sayings

¹ NTAF, p. 44.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 56. Massaux cites J. Huby (*Saint Paul, Première Épître aux Corinthiens*, p. 90f.) as favouring Rabbinic tradition, but no evidence is set forth to substantiate the hypothesis. Cf. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 1948), p. 307. P. Drews argues that the citation is taken from an ancient liturgical tradition. *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

³ AF II, 60.

⁴ *Agrapha*¹, TU 5, p. 102f.; cf. pp. 154-167. Resch's references are: *Constitutions* VII, 32; Clement of Alexandria *Protrepticus* X, 94; Athanasius *De Virginitate* 18; Epi-phanianus *Haer.* LXIV, 69; Origen in *Jerem. Hom.* XVIII, 15; Hegesippus, Stephen Gobarus ap. Photium, cod. 232, col. 893; *Hom. Clem.* II, 13. To this list the Oxford Committee adds *Actus Petri* 10; *Acts of Thomas*, Syriac (ed. Wright, p. 205), and 2 Cl. 11.7. We may note that the saying, or a variation thereof, is found in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas, Logion 17. "Jesus said: I shall give you what no eye has seen and no hand has touched and (what) has not entered the heart of man". B. M. Metzger's translation, in *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, ed. K. Aland (Stuttgart, 1964), p. 519. Cf. also Martyrdom of Polycarp 2.3; Tertullian, *de resurr.* 26.

of Jesus.¹ Ropes, however, effectively refuted Resch's claims, but without suggesting an alternative explanation of the phenomena.²

The Oxford Committee's conclusion is based on the exaggerated premise that "the context, and therefore the meaning of the passage in Clement, is entirely different from that in St. Paul".³ Clement according to the Committee refers to "the rewards promised to the servants of God" whereas Paul has in mind "the hidden mysteries which are revealed to the believers by the Spirit of God". While a slight difference in emphasis may be admitted, it is incorrect to dissociate the two citations as entirely different in meaning, for surely included in the hidden wisdom ἦν προώρισεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν (1 Cor. 2.7) is the fact that εἰς τὸ μετόχους ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι τῶν μεγάλων καὶ ἐνδόξων ἐπαγγελιῶν αὐτοῦ (Cl. 34.7). Thus there is no reason why Clement's application of the citation may not have been readily derived from 1 Cor. 2.

The Oxford Committee is also impressed with the number of parallels to Clement's passage found in early Christian literature, all of which agree with Clement's application of the citation and none of which, by the Committee's faulty premise, can be derived from 1 Cor. 2.9. All these citations including Clement's and Paul's are accordingly traced back to a pre-Christian source. But, as has already been argued, no convincing reason has been given why all of these citations may not have been derived from 1 Cor. 2.9. Indeed, it is futile to argue that they do not trace back to 1 Cor. 2.9 when pre-Pauline evidence for the citation in its present form is totally lacking. To be sure, Origen (*Comm. on Mt.* 27.9) refers the quotation not to the LXX of Isaiah, but to the Secrets (= Apocalypse) of Elijah, and Jerome (*Comm. on Is.* 64.4;

¹ *Agrapha*² TU 30, pp. 25-29; 110f. To illustrate its synoptic character Resch compared 1 Cor. 2.9 with the words of Jesus in Mt. 13.16f. and Lk. 10.23; 24.38, and the D text of Mt. 25.41. *Ibid.*, p. 28f. Resch fails to discuss the possibility that the citation in the larger quotations of *Apostolic Constitutions* and Clement of Alexandria (which do not agree) may be due to the interpolation of 1 Cor. 2.9. On the quotation in Clement of Alexandria see M. Mees, who argues that in *Stromata* V, 25, 5 the quotation stems from Paul, but in *Protrepticus* X, 94, Clement of Alexandria, like his Roman namesake in the present passage, cites "einen Text aus der Liturgie als Schrift". *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien* I, 204.

² *Die Sprüche Jesu*, TU 14, p. 21f.

³ *NTAF*, p. 43. Cf. Werner who writes of the "quite different framework" of the quotation in Clement and Paul, and who prefers a common apocryphal source. "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the *Prima Clementis*", p. 800.

Prol. to Gen. Ep. 57.9) confirms the presence of the citation in the Apocalypse of Elijah indicating that it was also to be found in the Ascension of Isaiah. Both of these books, however, are probably second century Christian pseudepigrapha¹ or, if pre-Christian, have without question been Christianized, and therefore may well be dependent upon 1 Corinthians for the citation under discussion.

What is needed to establish any argument that Clement is not dependent on 1 Cor. 2.9 is pre-Pauline evidence of the citation.² All of the existing parallels are in fact post-Clementine, may naturally be explained as dependent upon 1 Corinthians or even Clement's epistle itself, and are therefore not admissible as evidence for the source of the citation. As for the source of Clement's citation, the certain fact that Clement not only knew, but made free use of 1 Corinthians is overwhelmingly determinative in concluding that he is dependent upon 1 Cor. 2.9. The question concerning the source of Paul's citation is somewhat more difficult.³ Two factors, however, seem to favour a Septuagintal origin for 1 Cor. 2.9. Because Clement's original text (Codex A) reflects certain corrections made with reference to the LXX (i.e. the omission of the initial α ; the omission of δ θεός; the substitution of $\upsilon\piο\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nuου\sigmaιν$ for $\acute{\alpha}\gammaα\pi\acute{\omega}\sigmaιν$), and possibly because the citation is introduced with the formula λέγει γάρ, it is apparent that Clement regarded the LXX of Is. 64.4 as the source of Paul's citation.⁴ Secondly, Paul introduces the citation with the formula ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται, thus indicating that he probably regarded the source of the words as canonical scripture.⁵ Paul elsewhere (e.g. Rom. 9.33; 10.6-8; 14.11) can use similar

¹ Lightfoot I, 2, 106.

² J. Weiss, after a long discussion of the passage, writes "Die Quellenfrage lässt sich hier nicht erledigen; aber gegen die Benutzung eines Apokryphon durch P. ist nicht das Geringste einzuwenden". *Der erste Korintherbrief*, Meyer Komm. (Göttingen, 1925), p. 59. It is the lack of evidence that makes the claim of a non-canonical source objectionable.

³ For the various hypotheses suggested see Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 35. P. Prigent, making use of Strack-Billerbeck, has argued at length for a Rabbinic origin of the citation as found in Paul. See "Ce que l'œil n'a pas vu, 1 Cor. 2.9." *ThZ* 14 (1953), 416-429. Cf. the full discussion in A. Feuillet, "L'Énigme de 1 Cor., II, 9", *RB* 70 (1963), 52-74, where attention is called to the parallels in the wisdom literature.

⁴ Robertson and Plummer, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1911), p. 41.

⁵ C. K. Barrett rightly calls attention to the formula, concluding that "Paul believed that he was quoting the OT and we must conclude either that he was doing so from memory, and very inaccurately, or that he had a text, perhaps of Isa. LXIV, LXV different from ours". *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London, 1968), p. 73.

introductory formulae for very loosely worded citations from canonical writings. Here as in the previous citation, Paul's departure from the LXX may possibly be due to a free handling of the text in accordance with his own immediate purposes. We conclude then that in the light of the evidence presently available, the most justifiable explanation of the citation is that Paul is dependent on the LXX, and Clement in turn upon Paul.¹

In one other OT citation, it is just possible that Clement has been influenced by 1 Corinthians. Thus in what is apparently a free rendering of Dt. 32.15, Clement writes (3.1) ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔπιεν, καὶ ἐπλατύνθη, καὶ ἐπαχύνθη καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἡγαπημένος. Ἐπιεν, however, is found neither in the Hebrew nor the LXX, and thus the words ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔπιεν may deliberately allude to 1 Cor. 10.7 ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πεῖν (a citation from Ex. 32.6)² or to 1 Cor. 15.32 φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὐριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν (Is. 22.13).

Other possible allusions which must be mentioned are the following. Clement's reference to ἀθλητάς in 5.1 and the words of 5.5, Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ὑπέδειξεν may reflect 1 Cor. 9.24, οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχοντες πάντες μὲν τρέχουσιν, εἰς δὲ λαμβάνει τὸ βραβεῖον; However, the imagery of the athletic games was doubtless a popular metaphor in describing the Christian way of life (cf. especially Phil. 3.14). There is possibly a reminiscence of 1 Cor. 4.10 in the antithesis of Cl. 3.3 :

Clement 3.3

1 Corinthians 4.10

οὕτως ἐπηγέρθησαν
οἱ ἄτιμοι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐντίμους,
οἱ ἄδοξοι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνδόξους

c, ὑμεῖς ἑνδοξοί, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἄτιμοι

οἱ ἄφρονες ἐπὶ τοὺς φρόνιμους,
οἱ νέοι ἐπὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους

a, ἡμεῖς μωροὶ διὰ Χριστόν,
ὑμεῖς δὲ φρόνιμοι ἐν Χριστῷ
b, ἡμεῖς ἀσθενεῖς, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰσχυροί

For two of the clauses (i.e. those beginning with οἱ ἄτιμοι and οἱ νέοι), however, Clement is probably dependent upon the LXX of Is. 3.5. The words παραδεδωκότας and ἐψώμισαν in Cl. 55.2 may recall the similarly used ψωμίσω and παραδῶ of 1 Cor. 13.3. In the same

¹ This is the viewpoint of Lightfoot I, 2, 106; cf. *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul* (London, 1895), p. 176ff. Knopf accepts that Clement is dependent on Paul, but not that Paul's source was the LXX. *Op. cit.*, p. 103. Clarke (*op. cit.*, p. 99). Barnett (*op. cit.*, p. 93) and Jacquier (*op. cit.*, I, 44) agree that Clement's citation is from 1 Cor. 2.9.

² Grant, *AF* II, 21.

place, Clement's words πολλοὶ ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν εἰς δουλείαν are similar in thought to the words of 1 Cor. 9.19 πᾶσιν ἑμαυτὸν ἐδούλωσα.¹

Similarity of idea, and therefore possibility of allusion, is also to be found in Cl. 48.6 where the words καὶ ζητεῖν τὸ κοινωφελὲς πᾶσιν, καὶ μὴ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ, may well echo 1 Cor. 10.24 μηδεὶς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ζητεῖτω ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ ἐτέρου (cf. also 1 Cor. 10.33 μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἑμαυτοῦ σύμφορον ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν). The idea of Cl. 38.2 ὁ ἀγνὸς ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μὴ ἀλαζονευέσθω, γνώσκων ὅτι ἕτερός ἐστιν ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐγκράτειαν bears a resemblance to that of 1 Cor. 4.7 τί δὲ ἔχεις ὁ οὐκ ἔλαβες; εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔλαβες, τί καυχᾶσαι ὡς μὴ λαβὼν;

Further parallels in idea need not be mentioned since they become so general in nature that it is impossible to recognize them as definite allusions to 1 Corinthians. Similarly, lists of isolated words or stereotyped phrases which are common to Clement and 1 Corinthians must for the same reason remain unconvincing.² Enough, however, has been said to establish Clement's frequent reliance upon 1 Corinthians.

We must now turn to the question of Clement's knowledge of 2 Corinthians. Does Clement use this epistle, or does he in any way betray a knowledge of it? As we have already seen, Clement wrote (47.1): ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Question has been raised as to whether this reference to ἐπιστολὴν, in the singular, can be taken to indicate Clement's ignorance of Paul's subsequent letter(s) to the Corinthians. Lightfoot, followed by Knopf³ and Grant,⁴ has pointed out however that no such conclusion is warranted since for ancient writers "where the context clearly shows which epistle [of a pair] is meant, no specification is needed".⁵ There can be little doubt from the references to Cephas and Apollos, in the words with which Clement continues, that the Corinthian readers would have known which letter Clement had in mind. Nonetheless it will be clear from what follows that the evidence for Clement's knowledge of 2 Corinthians is rather slight.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

² See Massaux, *op. cit.*, p. 58f.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 122f.

⁴ *AF* II, 78.

⁵ I, 2, 143. Lightfoot provides examples from Irenaeus, Origen, Methodius, Macarius, Jerome, Anastasius of Sinai, and Chrysostom. Cf. Zahn, *GNTK* I, 812. Despite a number of references to parallels in his commentary, Lightfoot adds "I have not observed any distinct traces of the influence of 2 Corinthians on Clement's language or thoughts". *Ibid.*

To begin with, passages which may possibly allude to 2 Corinthians, but which are also paralleled in other epistles known to Clement (e.g. Cl. 13.1=1 Cor. 1.31 [2 Cor. 10.17]; Cl. 38.2=1 Cor. 16.17 [2 Cor. 9.12]; Cl. 24.5=1 Cor. 15.37 [*γυμνοί*, 2 Cor. 5.3]; Cl. 30.6=Rom. 2.29 [2 Cor. 10.18]), cannot be accepted as evidence of Clement's knowledge of 2 Corinthians. While some of these passages may be actual reminiscences of 2 Corinthians the safest conclusion is that they derive from epistles which are known to have been used by Clement.

Perhaps the most important of the possible allusions to 2 Corinthians is found in Clement's references to Paul's sufferings in 5.5f: *διὰ ζήλον καὶ ἔριν Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ὑπέδειξεν, ἑπτάκις δεσμὰ φορέσας, φυγαδευθείς, λιθασθείς*. This list bears some similarity to the much longer list of tribulations which Paul himself presents in 2 Cor. 11.23ff. In particular, *ἑπτάκις δεσμὰ φορέσας* parallels *ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως* (11.23); *φυγαδευθείς* may reflect the incident recorded in 11.32f.; and *λιθασθείς* is the equivalent of *ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθην* (11.25). It is possible then that Clement is here directly alluding to the list of 2 Cor. 11, or perhaps indirectly so, having taken the suggestion of such a list from the passage.¹ This latter possibility also allows for the fact that the source of Clement's *ἑπτάκις* remains unknown. It may be questioned why, if he knew 2 Corinthians, Clement did not make more explicit use of this famous passage in writing to the very same Church. Yet because Clement's passage does show contact, however slight, with 2 Cor. 11, one wonders whether J. H. Kennedy was justified in saying that Clement "totally ignored" the passage.² Certainly Clement's words bear enough similarity to 2 Cor. 11 to have immediately reminded his readers of that passage; perhaps Clement felt it unnecessary to duplicate the passage so well known to his readers, and remained content with the mere suggestion of it.³

Another possible allusion is found in Clement's words in 36.2, *διὰ τούτου ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὰ ὕψη τῶν οὐρανῶν, διὰ τούτου ἐνοπτρίζομεθα τὴν ἁμωμον καὶ ὑπερτάτην ὄψιν αὐτοῦ* which may be remi-

¹ Barnett writes "The suggestion of such a list would almost certainly come from a recollection of the list in 2 Corinthians". *Op. cit.*, p. 91.

² *The Second and Third Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (London, 1900), p. 150.

³ Beyschlag writes "Daß der Verfasser des 1 Clem seine Kenntnis über die Schicksale des Paulus in c. 5 mindestens zum Teil aus den paulinischen Briefen gewonnen habe, ist, trotz aller Divergenzen, die dabei nicht zu übersehen sind, immer wieder behauptet worden, vor allem für das Motiv der "Steinigung" von 1 Cl 5,6 (vgl. II Kor. 11,25)". *Op. cit.*, p. 32. For Beyschlag, however, the alleged dependence is unconvincing.

niscient of 2 Cor. 3.18: ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος.

The contact between the passages would not be impressive were it not for the similar verbs *ἐνοπτριζόμεθα* and *κατοπτριζόμενοι*. Not much may be concluded from this isolated similarity, however, except to indicate the possibility that Clement may here allude to the Pauline passage.¹

The words of Cl. 2.7 could possibly be dependent upon 2 Cor. 9.8, but Clement's *ἔτοιμοι* makes agreement with Titus or 2 Tim. 2.21 more probable, as can be seen from the following.

Cl. 2.7 - ἔτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν

(Cl. 33.1 - πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν ἐπιτελεῖν)

(Cl. 34.4 - ἐπὶ πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν)

2 Cor. 9.8 - περισσεύητε εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν

Tit. 3.1 - πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν ἐτόιμους εἶναι

2 Tim. 2.21 - εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν ἡτοιμασμένον

2 Tim. 3.17 - πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν ἐξηρτισμένους

Since Clement elsewhere seems to allude to Titus,² the present words may also be taken as an allusion to Tit. 3.1 rather than to 2 Cor. 9.8.

OT phraseology found in Cl. 2.8 may suggest contact with 2 Cor. 3.3.

Clement 2.8

τὰ προστάγματα καὶ
τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ κυρίου
ἐπὶ τὰ πλάτη
τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν
ἐγγράπτο.

2 Corinthians 3.3

ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ
διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν,
ἐγγεγραμμένη ...
οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις
ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίναίς.

Proverbs 7.3 (LXX)

περίθου δὲ αὐτοὺς
σοῖς δακτύλοις
ἐπίγραφον δὲ
ἐπὶ τὸ πλάτος
τῆς καρδίας σου.

However, as can be seen, Clement's words agree more closely with the LXX of Pr. 7.3. It is also significant that Clement uses the word *πλάτος*, which is found in the LXX text, and not Paul's *πλάξ*, a more correct translation of the underlying Hebrew word *חֵלֶם*.³ Thus it is

¹ The verb *κατοπτρίζομαι* is used in a similar way by Philo in *Legum alleg.* 3.33. For the Hellenistic use of the imagery see R. Reitzenstein, *Historia Monachorum und Historia Lausiaca*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Neue Folge 7. Heft (Göttingen, 1916), p. 244ff.

² See below, p. 234ff.

³ Lightfoot sees the *πλάτος* of Pr. 7.3 as due to the result of an early misreading of *πλάκος*. I, 2, 19. Cf. Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

difficult to allow that Clement here reveals any influence of 2 Corinthians.

The final clause of Cl. 41.1, *μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὠρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα*, may be an adoption of a similar metaphor used in 2 Cor. 10.13f.: *ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχησόμεθα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος οὃ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς μέτρον, ἐφικέσθαι ἄχρι καὶ ὑμῶν. οὐ γὰρ ὡς μὴ ἐφικνούμενοι εἰς ὑμᾶς ὑπερεκτείνομεν ἑαυτοὺς κτλ.* Although the contexts of the two passages are very different, the specific point made is quite similar. This is underlined by the common use of *κανών*, and the more generally parallel *ὠρισμένον* and *ἐμέρισεν*, and *παρεκβαίνων* and *ὑπερεκτείνομεν*. Clement's argument against self-commendation in 38.2 *ὁ ταπεινοφρονῶν μὴ ἑαυτῷ μαρτυρεῖτω, ἀλλ' ἐάτω ὑφ' ἐτέρου ἑαυτὸν μαρτυρεῖσθαι* is very similar in concept to Paul's words in 2 Cor. 10.12, *οὐ γὰρ τολμῶμεν ἐγκρίναι ἢ συγκρίναι ἑαυτοὺς τισιν τῶν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστανόντων · ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑαυτοὺς μετροῦντες καὶ συγκρίνοντες ἑαυτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς οὐ συνιᾶσιν.* However, there is no verbal contact, and similar ideas are also found plainly enough in 1 Cor. (4.5,7; 1.31). When Clement writes (55.3) *πολλὰ γυναικες ἐνδυναμωθεῖσαι διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπετελέσαντο πολλὰ ἀνδρεία*, he could possibly have in mind the words of 2 Cor. 12.9: *ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου · ἡ γὰρ δύναμις ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖται.* The relation between *χάρις* and *δύναμις* is especially striking and the connection of *ἀσθένεια* with *γυναικες* a natural one.

The allusions just examined—indeed, all the allusions to 2 Corinthians which can be gleaned from Clement—provide interesting possibilities but are not at all conclusive concerning Clement's knowledge of the epistle. Kennedy has forcefully argued that, considering Clement's penchant for borrowing phraseology serviceable to his purpose from other NT writings (1 Corinthians and Hebrews), it is inconceivable that had he known 2 Corinthians he could have neglected to employ it in his argument. "Chapters 10-13 of 2 Corinthians are full of rebukes of the Corinthians for sedition and rebellion—the very sins which Clement had to censure".¹ Yet when one reads through these chapters it is difficult to see what material Clement could have made use of (except perhaps 12.20 and the *εἰρηνεύετε* of 13.11) since the chapters are essentially autobiographical, being concerned with specific individuals who were making a personal attack on the Apostle, and thus

¹ Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

not as readily applicable to the Corinthian Church of Clement's day as Kennedy seems to think.¹ Indeed, it remains futile to speculate what effective use Clement might or might not have made of certain passages of Scripture.² In point of fact authors do not always act in accordance with our expectations and it is therefore dangerous to base conclusions on what we think they ought to have done. More serious than Kennedy's argument from silence, however, is his failure to admit the existence of possible allusions. If any of the allusions mentioned above are true, then Clement is not silent concerning 2 Corinthians. It must be remembered that Clement does not actually quote from any of the Pauline epistles or Hebrews; what we are confronted with are allusions of varying degrees of clarity. The allusions to 2 Corinthians in Clement's epistle may not happen to be as clear as those to 1 Corinthians, but they remain valid possibilities and cannot be ignored.³ We conclude then that although the evidence does not approach that concerning 1 Corinthians—an epistle with which Clement was certainly acquainted—there nonetheless remains a strong possibility that Clement knew and alluded to 2 Corinthians.⁴

¹ Guthrie wisely notes that "the data on which Kennedy argues [i.e. Clement's alleged failure to use 2 Corinthians] could be adequately explained on the simpler expedient that Clement was more impressed by 1 Corinthians than 2 Corinthians, or perhaps better understood it". *The Pauline Epistles* (London, 1963), p. 258, n. 1.

² Doubtless one could mention passages peculiarly appropriate to Clement's purpose, in writings he certainly knew, but which he had failed to use, or conversely, passages which Clement used which we ourselves would not have chosen. Wrede remarked on the lateness of Clement's reference to Paul's epistle to the Corinthians (47.1) "man wundert sich fast, dass es so spät geschieht". *Op. cit.*, p. 32.

³ J. Knox regards it as "very likely" that Clement had read our 2 Corinthians. *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul* (Chicago, 1935), p. 36f. Knoch writes that the question of Clement's use of 2 Corinthians is "weder sicher zu erweisen noch sicher zu bestreiten". *Op. cit.*, p. 85.

⁴ Because the evidence of Clement's knowledge of 2 Corinthians is so slight, it cannot be determined whether Clement knew only one of the letters that may have been put together to form 2 Corinthians. Clement's epistle, with its reference to Paul's "letter", could possibly have stimulated the compilation of other letters to form 2 Corinthians. On the other hand, this may have been accomplished earlier, or the letter may have been a unity from the beginning. In any event, there is no evidence that parts of our 2 Corinthians ever circulated independently outside of Corinth. Moreover, Clement quite possibly knew a ten epistle Pauline corpus, in which 2 Corinthians would have been a constituent part. See below, p. 283ff.

C. ROMANS

Paul's epistle to the Romans is the one NT epistle for which there exists an *a priori* probability that it was known to Clement and the Church at Rome. Written by Paul in the city of Corinth about 55 or 56 AD, the original manuscript itself was probably available to Clement. There is, indeed, perhaps not as much allusion to the epistle in Clement's letter as one might expect, but it is clear enough that Romans on more than one occasion came to mind as Clement wrote.

The clearest allusion is probably that which occurs in Cl. 35.5f. and which parallels Rom. 1.29ff.

Clement 35.5-6

(Text of A)

ἀπορρίψαντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν
 πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν
 καὶ ἀνομίαν,
 πλεονεξίαν,
 ἔρεις,
 κακοηθείας
 τε καὶ δόλους,
 ψιθυρισμούς
 τε καὶ καταλαλιάς,
 θεοστυγίαν,
 ὑπερηφανίαν
 τε καὶ ἀλαζονείαν,
 κενοδοξίαν
 τε καὶ [ἀ]φιλοξενίαν¹.

ταῦτα γὰρ οἱ πράσσοντες
 στυγητοὶ τῷ θεῷ ὑπάρχουσιν ·
 οὐ μόνον δὲ οἱ πράσσοντες αὐτά,
 ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ συνευδοκούντες αὐτοῖς.

Romans 1.29-31,32

(Text of Nestle-Aland)

πεπληρωμένους
 πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ
 πονηρίᾳ
 πλεονεξίᾳ κακίᾳ, μεστοὺς φθόνου φόνου
 ἔριδος
 δόλου
 κακοηθείας,
 ψιθυριστάς,
 καταλάλους,
 θεοστυγεῖς,
 ὕβριστάς,
 ὑπερηφάνους,
 ἀλαζόνας, ἐφρευρετὰς κακῶν, κτλ.

32, οἵτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες,
 ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες
 ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσίν,
 οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν,
 ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσιν τοῖς πράσσουσιν.

¹ A few variants occur in this list as found in the MSS and versions. Thus for ἀνομίαν, C supported by the Syriac and Latin reads πονηρίαν, apparently due to harmonization with the list in Romans 1. C omits πλεονεξίαν by apparent inadvertence, since both Latin and Syriac support A. Similarly A's φιλοξενίαν seems to be the result of an accidental omission of the alpha privative; thus C, supported by S, reads ἀφιλοξενίαν. L however has *inhumilitatem*, and this has led some (e.g. Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 105) to suggest that A should be emended to read φιλοδοξίαν. Unfortunately, chapter 35 is lacking in both Coptic MSS.

Clement does not give the full catalogue of sins found in Rom. 1 but what he does give agrees almost word for word and occurs in exactly the same order (except for the reversal of δόλου and κακοηθείας). Besides Clement's ἀνομίαν (for πονηρία), only the final two items κενοδοξίαν and ἀφιλοξενίαν, are not found in Romans, presumably having been added by Clement as particularly appropriate to the Corinthian Church.¹

Equally impressive in its similarity to Rom. 1 is the sentence which follows the catalogue. Except for Clement's substitution of the slightly milder στυγητοὶ τῷ θεῷ ὑπάρχουσιν for ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσὶν the sentence is essentially the same. In the last half of the sentence Clement agrees even more closely with Rom. 1.32 as found in the reading of B αὐτὰ ποιοῦντες ... συνευδοκοῦντες and the old Latin and Clementine Vulgate οἱ ποιοῦντες ... συνευδοκοῦντες (*qui ea faciunt ... consentiunt facientibus*). Zuntz regards the participles of Clement's text as reflecting a corrupted text and conjectures that they may have been in the copy of the letter which Paul himself sent to Rome while the correct reading was preserved in another authentic copy of the epistle.² However, since Clement is obviously not quoting verbatim (as the use of πράσσω for ποιέω indicates), it is perhaps easier to believe that Clement's paraphrase was itself the cause of the participial forms in the MS of Romans which lay behind B, the old Latin and the Clementine Vulgate. (The early popularity of Clement's epistle could easily account for its influence on a scribe copying Romans I.) On the other hand, it is possible that the participial forms in question reflect the original text of the epistle and that the smoother reading contained in the favoured

¹ Despite the fact that the list is taken from Rom. 1, there seems to be no reason why Clement could not have rounded it off with words pertinent to the situation at Corinth. Contra, Knopf, *op. cit.*, p. 105. Sanders, while admitting that Clement's catalogue is derived from Rom. 1, regards Clement's ἀφιλοξενία (and θεοστυγία) as another indication that Clement has been influenced by Hellenistic literature. *Op. cit.*, p. 77f. Werner surmises a common source for Cl. 35.6 and Rom. 1.32. "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis", p. 801. Cf. E. Peterson who, noting a similar passage in *Testament of Asher* (VI, 2), suggests that Clement and Paul are dependent upon an apocalyptic writing. *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Rome, 1959), p. 96. But even though Paul were here dependent upon a Jewish source, any argument that Clement is dependent upon the same source seems far-fetched in the light of Clement's clear knowledge of Romans.

² *The Text of the Epistles*, p. 219f.

textual tradition is an attempt to cover over the resultant anacoluthon as it came from the hand of Paul.¹

In addition to the catalogue itself and the concluding sentence, a contact may perhaps be found in the introductory words where Clement's τὰ ἀνήκοντα (35.5) stands in contrast to τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα of Rom. 1.28. More probably, however, Clement's words are to be traced to the influence of Stoic terminology.

We conclude that the clear and repeated parallelisms between these two lengthy passages is compelling and that Clement's dependence upon Romans is the only satisfactory conclusion which can be drawn.

A second allusion is almost certainly to be found in 32.2 where Clement describes what has come from Jacob, ἐξ αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευῖται πάντες οἱ λειτουργοῦντες τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ τοῦ θεοῦ · ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. These words strongly resemble Rom. 9.4f. where Paul, speaking of the Israelites, writes ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, ὧν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. Here we have a clear parallelism of ideas: on the one hand, from the Israelites, on the other from Jacob, is seen to come not only the service of God in worship, but also ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς / ὁ Χριστὸς, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. This last phrase common to both passages is particularly significant and seems to be the very kind of reminiscence to Romans which one would expect from Clement as he wrote.²

A further allusion is very probably to be seen in Cl. 33.1: τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν, ἀδελφοί; ἀργήσωμεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγαθοποιίας καὶ ἐγκαταλείπωμεν τὴν ἀγάπην; μηθαμῶς τοῦτο ἐάσαι ὁ δεσπότης ἐφ' ἡμῖν γε γενηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ σπεύσωμεν μετὰ ἐκτενείας καὶ προθυμίας πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτελεῖν. These words are very similar to Paul's in Rom. 6.1: τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις

¹ This suggestion is made by J. N. Birdsall, "The New Testament Text", *CHB* I, eds. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge, 1970), p. 335f.

² The Oxford Committee rightly remark that "The phrase τὸ κατὰ σάρκα is not a very obvious one". *NTAF*, p. 39. H.-W. Bartsch has also called attention to the parallel phrase τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. "Röm. 9,5 und 1. Clem. 32,4" *ThZ* 21 (1965), 401-409. There are, as Bartsch indicates, similarities between Cl. 32.4 and Rom. 9.5. He seems to go too far, however, when he maintains that the former is a "paraphrase" of the latter. In any event, it is impossible to support the conjectural reading ὧν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός for ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός in Rom. 9.5 on the basis of Clement's text as Bartsch attempts to do: "Dass Clemens dies jedoch in Röm. 9,5 gelesen hat, dürfte sich daran erweisen, dass er ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός durch ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεός ersetzt" (p. 403). The title ὁ παντοκράτωρ, however, is a common one in Clement's epistle and may be unrelated to Rom. 9.5.

πλεονάσῃ; μὴ γένοιτο. It is not merely the similarity in form of the two successive rhetorical questions in these passages that is to be noticed, but particularly the similarity of the underlying thought. Indeed, in Clement as in Paul, what gives rise to the questions is the emphasis of justification by faith which immediately precedes them. Paul is continuing the well known argument of Rom. 3-5 when he is prompted to ask the questions; Clement shows his acquaintance with the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith in 32.3f., writing (32.4) οὐ δι' ἐαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας ἢ συνέσεως ἢ εὐσεβείας ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως. δι' ἧς πάντας τοὺς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν (cf. Rom. 5.1). Thereupon he poses questions, exactly as did Paul, to prevent a misunderstanding of the practical implications of justification by faith.¹ There can be little doubt that Clement here patterns his thoughts after Paul's model in Rom. 6.1.

At several points where Clement may be alluding to Romans the question is made more difficult by the occurrence of similar words in other Pauline epistles. Thus while Clement's use of the metaphor of the body and its members (37.5; 38.1; 46.7) can, as we have seen, be accounted for as a reminiscence of 1 Cor. 12 (and 6.15), it is equally possible that Clement may also reflect Rom. 12.4f. (or Eph. 4.25; 5.30). Another example of this problem can be seen in Cl. 34.2: ἐξ αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐστὶν τὰ πάντα which may trace back to 1 Cor. 8.6 (ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα) or to Rom. 11.36 (ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα). Similarly, in Cl. 36.2 the phrase ἡ ἀσύνετος καὶ ἐσκοτωμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν, and in 51.5 τὰς ἀσυνέτους καρδίας may well be a reflection of Rom. 1.21 ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία.² However, it is also possible that Eph. 4.18, ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ

¹ Massaux's refusal to recognize the presence of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith in Clement because of Clement's emphasis on good works, is based on his mistaken assumption that Paul's teaching excludes the necessity of exhortation to good works. *Op. cit.*, p. 51ff. But Paul himself frequently urges the necessity of good works (e.g. Rom. 6.12f.; 6.19; 13.12f.; Gal. 5.21). Lightfoot is correct when he regards Clement as combining the teaching of Paul and James which is "verbally, though not essentially, antagonistic". I, 1, 96. Cf. Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the NT* (London, 1896), p. 25.

² Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 110, 2) quotes this passage from the Roman Clement in verbatim agreement except for the substitution of ἐσκοτισμένη for ἐσκοτωμένη by apparent harmonization with Rom. 1.21. This would seem to indicate that whoever was responsible for the harmonization regarded the phrase as an allusion to Rom. 1.

διανοία ὄντες, is the source of Clement's language. In 40.1 the words εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως could possibly be a reflection of 1 Cor. 2.10: τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα πάντα ἐρευνᾷ, καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ, or Eph. 3.18 ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μήκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος, ἰγνῶναί τε τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ, or perhaps more probably, Rom. 11.33: ὁ βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ. There are two factors which make it difficult to trace allusory language in such cases as these: first, the overlapping in doctrine and phraseology in the Pauline epistles; and second, the fact that Clement paraphrases and does not quote. Consequently there can be no certainty concerning the source of these various allusions, although one may more safely attribute them to Romans or 1 Corinthians—epistles well attested in Clement—than to Ephesians.

Possible influence of Romans on Clement is to be seen in connection with at least one of two OT citations common to both. In 50.6,7 Clement quotes Ps. 31.1,2: γέγραπται γάρ · μακάριοι, ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι · μακάριος ἀνὴρ, οὐ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν, οὐδέ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος. These words are in exact agreement with the LXX text and with the citation as found in Rom. 4.7f. which, however, omitting the last clause, ends with the word ἁμαρτίαν. Because Clement's text is in verbatim agreement with the LXX, is introduced with the formula γέγραπται, and gives the full sentence while Paul omits the final clause, it is certain that Clement is dependent upon the LXX. It is in his next sentence (50.7), however, that Clement seems to indicate influence from Rom. 4, for he writes οὗτος ὁ μακαρισμὸς ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐκλελεγμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. It is almost as though Clement were answering the question Paul asks immediately following the same citation (Rom. 4.9): ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν; This interesting parallel, occurring immediately after the same OT citation, shows either that the citation itself was suggested by Rom. 4.7f., or that in the actual process of citing Ps. 31.1f., Clement recalled Paul's use of the citation and the words which immediately follow it.

In the second of the OT citations it is very less certain that Clement has been influenced by Romans. In 10.6 Clement quotes Gn. 15.5f. in close agreement with the LXX. The text of Gn. 15.6, however, as quoted by Clement, ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, is in verbatim agreement with the citation

in Rom. 4.3 and Jas. 2.23, while lacking the LXX's initial *καί*, and inserting the particle *δέ* after *ἐπίστευσεν*, where the LXX has none. (The citation is found again in Gal. 3.6 where it lacks both *καί* and *δέ*.) Thus despite Clement's obvious dependence on the LXX, it is possible that Clement has been affected by the text of Gn. 15.6 found in Rom. 4.3 (or Jas. 2.23), although perhaps the single difference—i.e. the substitution of the postpositive *δέ* for the connective *καί*—should not be emphasized.

Further possible allusions are to be seen in Cl. 30.6 and 47.7. In 30.6 Clement's words *ὁ ἔπαινος ἡμῶν ἔστιν ἐν θεῷ καὶ μὴ ἐξ αὐτῶν · αὐτεπαινετοὺς γὰρ μισεῖ ὁ θεός* are comparable to those of Rom. 2.29 where Paul describes the person who is truly a Jew as one *οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*. The same thought is found in 1 Cor. 4.5 (*καὶ τότε ὁ ἔπαινος γενήσεται ἐκάστῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*) and 2 Cor. 10.18 (*οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἑαυτὸν συνίστάνων, ἐκείνός ἐστιν δόκιμος, ἀλλὰ ὃν ὁ κύριος συνίστησιν*), where the parallels are perhaps not as close as those found in Romans. In 47.7 when Clement speaks of the scandal of the Corinthian Church to those outside the communion, he adds *ὥστε καὶ βλασφημίας ἐπιφέρεισθαι τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀφροσύνην*. This could well be an allusion to the citation found in Rom. 2.24 *τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καθὼς γέγραπται*. Alternatively, however, Clement may be alluding to the source of the citation itself (Is. 52.5).

Similarity of ideas which may suggest allusion can be seen in the following instances. In 38.2 Clement exhorts *ὁ ἰσχυρὸς μὴ [ἀ]τημελείτω τὸν ἀσθενῆ*,¹ an idea similar to the Pauline exhortation in Rom. 15.1 *ὀφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων βαστάζειν, καὶ μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν* (cf. Rom. 14.1). In his long prayer near the end of his epistle Clement writes (60.1): *σύ τὴν ἀέναον τοῦ κόσμου σύστασιν διὰ τῶν ἐνεργουμένων ἐφανεροποίησας · σύ, κύριε, τὴν οἰκουμένων ἔκτισας ... ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῷ κτίζειν καὶ συνετὸς ἐν τῷ τὰ γενόμενα ἐδράσαι, ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἐν τοῖς ὀρωμένοις*. This idea that the visible creation manifests something of the character of God is very possibly reminiscent of Rom. 1.20: *τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα*

¹ There is confusion as to the text of A. Lake says it reads *μὴ τημελείτω*. Lightfoot says *μὴ τημελείτω*. The photocopy of the MS is impossible to read beyond the initial *MHT*.

καθορᾶται, ἥ τε αἰδῖος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης. In the same prayer Clement urges submission to rulers and governors adding that they have their office from God (61.1) :

σύ, δέσποτα, ἔδωκας τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῖς διὰ τοῦ μεγαλοπρεποῦς καὶ ἀνεκδιηγῆτου κράτους σου, εἰς τὸ γινώσκοντας ἡμᾶς τὴν ὑπὸ σοῦ αὐτοῖς δεδομένην δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ὑποτάσσεσθαι αὐτοῖς, μηδὲν ἐναντιουμένους τῷ θελήματί σου · οἷς δός, κύριε, ὑγίειαν, εἰρήνην, ὁμόνοιαν, εὐστάθειαν, εἰς τὸ διέπειν αὐτοὺς τὴν ὑπὸ σοῦ δεδομένην αὐτοῖς ἡγεμονίαν ἀπροσκόπως.

These words can be regarded as an expansion of Paul's teaching in Rom. 13.1 : *πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν.* Finally, in 64.1 when Clement pronounces a benediction on his readers, calling upon God *ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*, he could possibly reflect Rom. 1.4 *τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ... Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.*

Some of these allusions are less convincing than others, but all are possibilities deserving of consideration. Again the list could be extended —no single listing can rightly be claimed as exhaustive. Yet the most significant of the possible allusions have been discussed and the unassailable conclusion is that Clement was thoroughly familiar with Paul's epistle to the Romans and that he automatically, almost unconsciously, weaves its ideas and phraseology into his own epistle.

D. THE REMAINING PAULINE EPISTLES

It is not surprising that Clement's knowledge of the longer NT epistles such as Hebrews, 1 Corinthians, and Romans is evidenced by a number of clear allusions. The probability of the occurrence of allusions, however, decreases in proportion to the decrease of the length of an epistle. Thus on *a priori* grounds it is not to be expected that attestation by allusion will be as convincing for the shorter Pauline epistles as it is in the case of 1 Corinthians and Romans. Because of the lessened probability of allusions to these shorter epistles, the argument from silence (*viz.*, that since Clement does not allude to an epistle he does not know of it) becomes increasingly precarious. Nevertheless, in our concern for any positive indication of Clement's knowledge of these epistles we shall (as in our consideration of 2 Corinthians) in almost every case dismiss as evidence material which because of overlapping can be accounted for on the basis of 1 Corinthians or Romans.

1. *Galatians*

In the words of 2.1, καὶ τὰ παθήματα αὐτοῦ ἦν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ὑμῶν, Clement appears to allude to the words of Paul in Gal. 3.1, οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος. Moreover, this common appeal to the vividness (κατ' ὀφθαλμούς / πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν) with which the sufferings of Christ were perceived by the Galatians and Corinthians occurs in almost identical contexts. The idea is employed by both Paul and Clement to heighten, by way of rebuke, the gravity of their readers' respective failures—for the Galatians, their apparent capitulation to the Judaizers (Gal. 3.10ff.); for the Corinthians, their lapse into jealousy, strife and disorder (Cl. 3.1ff.). Thus it is very probable, not only from the parallel ideas, but from the application of the ideas, that Clement here alludes to Galatians.¹

Speaking of Peter and Paul (among others), Clement writes in 5.2 : διὰ ζήλον καὶ φθόνον οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ δικαιοτάτοι στῦλοι ἐδιώχθησαν καὶ ἕως θανάτου ἠθλήσαν. In thus describing the apostles as στῦλοι Clement may allude to Gal. 2.9 where the same word describes James, Peter, and John, οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι. Although this metaphorical usage of the word has Jewish antecedents,² in the NT and early Christian literature it is found only in these two places. It seems probable that Clement has derived the word from Gal. 2.9 and thus rightly includes Paul among the στῦλοι, who in Galatians stand in contrast to Paul.³

Clement's exhortation (56.1) καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐντύχωμεν περὶ τῶν ἐν τινι παραπτώματι ὑπαρχόντων is similar to that of Gal. 6.1 : ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τινι παραπτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος. In addition to the same spirit of concern expressed by the two writers, the exact agreement in the phrase ἐν τινι παραπτώματι is striking. It would appear then that here too is a probable allusion to Galatians.

¹ The Oxford Committee prints Dt. 28.66 alongside Galatians and Clement at this point (*NTAF*, p. 52). However, if the relationship between Gal. 3.1 and Dt. 28.66 is doubtful, the suggested relationship between Cl. 2.1 and Dt. 28.66 is much more so.

² Lightfoot says the metaphor was "commonly used by the Jews in speaking of the great teachers of the law". *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London, 1874), p. 109.

³ Knopf has no hesitation in saying "Die Säulen stammen sicher aus Gal. 2". *Op. cit.*, p. 50. Cf. Massaux who speaks of "une allusion certaine", *op. cit.*, p. 46. Thus also Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

In the question asked in 31.2, *τίνας χάριν ὑπολογήθη ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, οὐχὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀλήθειαν διὰ πίστεως ποιήσας*; Clement may well reflect his knowledge of Paul's argument concerning Abraham found in Gal. 3. It is true, of course, that Abraham's justification by faith is discussed in Rom. 4. In the latter passage, however, no mention is made of Abraham's blessing or his having been blessed. In Gal. 3 both the verb *εὐλογέω* (3.9) and the noun *εὐλογία* (3.14) occur together with the concept *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* and *ἐκ πίστεως*. On the other hand, Clement's use of *εὐλογέω* may be due to the immediate context (cf. 31.1) and not to influence from Gal. 3. Thus at best we have here only the possibility of an allusion.¹

Similarity of idea can be seen in Cl. 49.6, *διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην, ἣν ἔσχεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἐν θελήματι θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν* and the final words of Gal. 2.20: *τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ*. If, however, Clement is dependent upon Paul for the underlying thought he could equally as well depend upon Eph. 5.2, *καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ὑμᾶς καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*. Again we have no more than possible dependence upon Galatians (or Ephesians). The words may well derive from a common kerygmatic tradition.

The word *κανών* used in reference to a rule of conduct is found in Cl. 1.3 and Gal. 6.16. Clement's frequently conjoined words *ζῆλος* and *φθόνος* (3.2; 4.7; 5.2) are found in close proximity in the list of vices in Gal. 5.19f., and *ἔρις*, which Clement links with *ζῆλος* (3.2; 6.4), is also found in the same list. However, these and other words common to Clement and Galatians which can be listed are not substantial enough to be regarded as convincing.

On the basis of the more compelling allusions we conclude that Clement quite probably knew and made use of the Epistle to the Galatians.

2. *Ephesians*

Clement seems to show his familiarity with Paul's Epistle to the

¹ It should be pointed out, with Lightfoot, that Clement here combines the teaching of Paul with that of James (2.21f.). I, 2, 97.

Ephesians in several places. One of the most impressive of the allusions is found in 46.6, every phrase of which is paralleled in Eph. 4.4-7.

Clement 46.6

ἡ οὐχὶ ἓνα θεὸν ἔχομεν
καὶ ἓνα Χριστόν
καὶ ἐν πνεύμα τῆς χάριτος
τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς

καὶ μία κλήσις ἐν Χριστῷ ;

Ephesians 4

6, εἰς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων
5, εἰς κύριος
4, ἐν πνεῦμα
7, ἐνὶ δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις
κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ
4, καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι
τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν.

While Clement has rearranged the elements into a more logical order, and although Clement lacks three additional elements found in the Ephesian passage : ἐν σῶμα (4.4); μία πίστις and ἐν βάπτισμα (4.5), it is difficult to doubt Clement's dependence on Ephesians. Similar passages are found in 1 Cor. 8.6 and 12.12f., but even when combined they cannot account for Clement's ἐν πνεύμα and μία κλήσις. The use of the verb ἐκχύνω in connection with πνεῦμα suggests the possible influence of Rom. 5.5 (cf. Acts 2) upon Clement's passage. If, as seems probable, Eph. 4.4-6 is based on a primitive confession of faith or an early Christian hymn, Clement could possibly provide independent witness to Paul's source.¹ Nevertheless, it is easier to suppose that Clement has derived the passage from Ephesians especially since, from the following, it seems that he was acquainted with the epistle.²

Clement's exhortation and prayer in 59.1-3 bear a certain resemblance to the first chapter of Ephesians. In particular, Clement's words (59.3) ἀνοίξας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ γινώσκειν σε, are strikingly similar to those of Eph. 1.18 πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας [ὑμῶν], εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς. The expression τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας, found also in Cl. 36.2, occurs nowhere in the LXX, nowhere else in the NT, and among the Apostolic Fathers besides Clement, only in Martyrdom of Polycarp 2.3. In addition to this particular phrase, however, Clement's larger context seems to betray other contacts with Eph. 1. There is the common concern for

¹ Passages in Hermas' *Shepherd* (Sim. IX, 13, 5 and 18, 4) may be due to suggestion from Eph. 4, but bear little resemblance to Clement's passage, and cannot be safely regarded as an independent witness to the source of the Pauline passage.

² We disagree with Barnett who says "aside from this single instance there is no very clear indication that Clement used Ephesians". *Op. cit.*, p. 98. It depends, of course, on how much the words "very clear" are emphasized. For none of the allusions to the the shorter NT epistles can we have more than probability.

holiness: in Eph. 1.4, εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἁμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ; in Cl. 59.2, ἀθῶοι ἐσόμεθα ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἁμαρτίας. The notion of election is prominent in both: Eph. 1.4, καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ; Cl. 59.2, τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ. Both refer to Jesus as the Beloved: Eph. 1.6 ἥς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ; Cl. 59.2, διὰ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου παιδὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. For both, the knowledge of Jesus is important: Eph. 1.17, δόξη ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ; Cl. 59.2, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν δόξης ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ (cf. also the importance of δόξα in Eph. 1). The impressive similarity of tone and content of the two passages make the conclusion that Clement is dependent upon Eph. 1.18 for the phrase οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας a very probable one.

When Clement writes (38.1) σωζέσθω οὖν ἡμῶν ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ὑποτασσέσθω ἕκαστος τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, he may well reflect Eph. 5.21, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ. Not only is it the idea of submission to one's neighbor that is significant, but also the fact that in the same context the metaphor of the body is applied to the church (cf. Eph. 5.23, καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος). This seems to indicate that Clement here provides a reminiscence of Eph. 5.21. Rom. 15.2 presents an allied idea, but the similarity is by no means as striking as it is between Clement and Ephesians.

In Cl. 14.3, the words χρηστευσώμεθα αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν εὐσπλαγχνίαν καὶ γλυκύτητα τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς are very similar in idea to Paul's words in Eph. 4.32-5.1: γίνεσθε δὲ εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοί, εὐσπλαγχνοί, χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχάρισατο ὑμῖν. γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητά. In addition to the verbal contacts χρηστευσώμεθα—χρηστοί, εὐσπλαγχνίαν—εὐσπλαγχνοί, both passages emphasize the gracious activity of God as a model (κατα—καθὼς) for showing kindness to others. Clement, however, does not spell out the implication as does Paul in the words γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ. The passages are similar enough to conclude that Clement is probably alluding to Eph. 4.32.

Clement appears to cite Wisdom 12.12 (and 11.21 ?) in 27.5.

Clement 27.5

τίς ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ ·
τί ἐποίησας ;
ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται
τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ;

Wisdom 12.12

τίς γὰρ ἐρεῖ,
τί ἐποίησας ;
ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται
τῷ κρίματί σου ;

[Wisdom 11.21]

καὶ κράτει βραχίονός σου
τίς ἀντιστήσεται ;

However, the last phrase of Clement, *τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ*, which is not found in Wisdom, is found in two places in Ephesians (1.19; 6.10). Clement's substitution of *αὐτοῦ* for *σοῦ* makes it difficult to believe that he is dependent on the Wisdom passages for this phrase. Although a similar phrase (*ἐν κράτει ἰσχύος*) is found in Is. 40.26, and the almost identical phrase *τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος μου* is found in Theodotion's text of Dn. 4.30, only the parallels of Ephesians can account for Clement's *αὐτοῦ* and there remains a strong possibility that Clement has here been influenced by the language of Ephesians.

Additional possible allusions are somewhat less convincing. In Cl. 26.1 the phrase *ἐν πεποιθήσει πίστεως ἀγαθῆς* (cf. 35.2) could possibly reflect the *ἐν πεποιθήσει διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ* of Eph. 3.12. When Clement writes of the Ninevites that they received salvation (7.7) *καίπερ ἄλλότριοι τοῦ θεοῦ ὄντες*, he may reflect Paul's words about the salvation of the Gentiles *ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ* κτλ. (Eph. 2.12). When Clement speaks of *τῇ παναρέτῳ καὶ σεβασμῷ κεκοσμημένοι* (2.8), he may refer to this same passage in Ephesians. However, if he is at all dependent on Paul, Phil. 1.27 or 3.20 seems a more likely source. Clement's words *ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ* in the benediction of chapter 64 could possibly be reminiscent of Eph. 1.4 : *καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ*. Again, while these various parallels remain possible allusions, because of their commonplace character they cannot be used to argue Clement's dependence on Ephesians.

Similarly, other passages which may be reminiscent of Ephesians are, when possible, more safely attributed to epistles which are better attested in Clement. Thus although the *ἐσκοτωμένη διάνοια* of Cl. 36.2 is very similar to the *ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ* of Eph. 4.18, the parallel in Rom. 1.21 is to be preferred. In 40.1, Clement's reference to *τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως* may perhaps be related to the *βάθος* of Eph. 3.18f., but is more safely attributed to the influence of Rom. 11.33 (or 1 Cor. 2.10). Clement's *ὑποτασσόμενοι* (2.1) could possibly be related to the identical word (in a similar context) in Eph. 5.21, but the same idea is found in Rom. 12.10,16 (cf. 1 Pet. 5.5). Similarly, Clement's reference to the proper obedience of wives to their husbands (1.3) may be reminiscent of that doctrine in Eph. 5.22ff., but is found also in 1 Cor. 14.34 (cf. 1 Pet. 3.1).

However, even with the exclusion of these possibilities as well as the less convincing of those mentioned earlier, it would seem that the

evidence justifies the conclusion that Clement was very probably familiar with Paul's letter to the Ephesians.¹

3. *Philippians*

In Clement's reference to Paul's letter to the Corinthians (47.1f.) Clement asks, as we already have seen, τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; The identical phrase ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is in the NT found only in Phil. 4.15: οἴδατε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς, Φιλιππηῖοι, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας κτλ.² If, as seems plausible, Clement is using the phrase in exactly the same way as Paul,³ it is probable that we have an allusion to Phil. 4.15.

Clement's words in 21.1, ἐὰν μὴ ἀξίως αὐτοῦ πολιτευόμενοι, are very similar to those in Phil. 1.27: μόνον ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύεσθε. Also to be compared is the clause in Cl. 3.4 πολιτεύεσθαι κατὰ τὸ καθήκον τῷ Χριστῷ. It may be, as the Oxford Committee suggest,⁴ that the metaphor of citizenship was commonly used with reference to the moral and spiritual life. Clement uses the word πολιτεία in referring to Christian conduct in 2.8, τῇ παναρέτῳ καὶ σεβασμῷ πολιτεία κεκοσμημένοι πάντα ἐν τῷ φόβῳ αὐτοῦ ἐπιτελεῖτε (cf. Phil. 3.20, ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει). However, the verb πολιτεύομαι is found only in one other place in the NT (Acts 23.1) and is used in a comparable manner in the Apostolic Fathers only in Hermas, *Sim.* V, 6, 6, and Polycarp, *Phil.* 5.2 (and in the latter place it is probably borrowed from Clement). The impressive similarity especially between Cl. 21.1 and Phil. 1.27 is probably due to the influence of Philippians on Clement.

Clement may allude to Phil. 2 when in 16.2 he writes: ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἦλθεν ἐν κόμπῳ ἀλαζονείας οὐδὲ ὑπερηφανίας, καίπερ δυνάμενος, ἀλλὰ ταπεινοφρονῶν. Paul in Phil. 2.6ff. similarly

¹ C. L. Mitton, in an examination of the parallels, admits that there can be no certainty, but judiciously writes "though it may be argued that they are the kind of phrases which would be incorporated in liturgical forms, it is probably easier to explain them on the assumption that Clement had read Ephesians than in any other way". *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (Oxford, 1951), p. 167. B. H. Streeter also considers it probable that Clement was influenced by Ephesians. *The Four Gospels* (London, 1924), p. 499, n. 1.

² Grant notes that this verse "refers to Paul's ministry at Corinth". *AF* II, 78.

³ For an alternative explanation, see p. 329f.

⁴ *NTAF*, p. 53f.

contrasts Christ's rightful position *ὅς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*, with his self-abasement, *ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν*. In the same context Clement exhorts his readers to humility (16.17) just as Paul does (Phil. 2.3). These similarities are interesting, but perhaps too general for us to conclude anything more than the possibility of allusion. Moreover, since an early Christian hymn may lie behind the Pauline passage—the marvelous truth of Christ's humility was doubtless enshrined in many hymns as well as in the teaching of the church (cf. 2 Cor. 8.9; Heb. 12.2)—Clement may here not be dependent on Philippians at all.

In 7.1 Clement, having cited the sufferings of the righteous (among whom is Paul, cf. 5.5ff.), admonishes his readers with the words *ἐν γὰρ τῷ αὐτῷ ἔσμεν σκάμματι, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ἀγὼν ἐπείκειται*. Paul employs exactly the same device in Phil. 1.30 where, having spoken of the necessity of suffering, he writes *τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχοντες οἷον εἶδετε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ νῦν ἀκούετε ἐν ἐμοί*. It seems probable that Clement is alluding to this passage in Philippians.

The imagery of the athletic games is employed often by Clement as it is in the Epistle to the Philippians. *Ἀγών*, as we have just seen, occurs in Cl. 7.1 and 2.4 (cf. *ἀγωνισώμεθα* in 35.4). In addition to the parallel in Phil. 1.30, however, the word is found in Col. 2.1; 1 Tim. 6.12; 2 Tim. 4.7; and Heb. 12.1. With Clement's *ἀθλητής* (5.1) may be compared the participle *συναθλοῦντες* of Phil. 1.27 and 4.3; but cf. *ἀθλῇ* of 2 Tim. 2.5; and *ἄθλησις* of Heb. 10.32. Similarly, the term *βραβεῖον* in Cl. 5.5 is found in Phil. 3.14; but also in 1 Cor. 9.24. Further, the *σκοπός* of Phil. 3.14 is found in Cl. 63.1. Because of the common usage of athletic metaphors, and because of the presence of the terminology in various Pauline epistles, none of these passages is effective in arguing for Clement's use of Philippians.

Clement's *εὐλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀκέραιοι ἦτε καὶ ἀμνησίκακοι εἰς ἀλλήλους* (2.5) could possibly reflect Phil. 1.10 *ἵνα ἦτε εὐλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ*. In the NT *εὐλικρινής* is found only here and in 2 Pet. 3.1. Clement's *ἀκέραιοι* is not identical with *ἀπρόσκοποι* (cf. *ἀπροσκόπως* in Cl. 20.10), but *ἀκέραιοι* is found in Phil. 2.15 *ἵνα γένησθε ἄμεμπτοι καὶ ἀκέραιοι* (cf. Rom. 16.19). One of Clement's favourite words, *ἐπιεικής* (1.2; 21.7; 29.1; cf. *ἐπιείκεια* 13.1; 30.8; 56.1; 58.2; 62.2), is found in Phil. 4.5; but also in several other NT epistles (1 Tim. 3.3; Tit. 3.2; Jas. 3.17; 1 Pet. 2.18). It is difficult to draw any significant conclusions from such isolated contacts as these.

In 42.4 Clement speaks in one phrase of *ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους*

(cf. 42.5, *περὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ διακόνων*) which is possibly reminiscent of Paul's address (Phil. 1.1) *τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνους*, the only place in the NT where the terms are thus linked (in 1 Tim. 3.1-13 the conduct of bishops and deacons is successively discussed). Clement indeed appeals to Scripture to justify the appointment of bishops and deacons (42.5): *οὕτως γάρ που λέγει ἡ γραφή· καταστήσω τοὺς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει*. But the LXX of Is. 60.17, which is apparently the passage Clement has in mind, reads: *δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντας σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*. The word *διάκονος* is totally lacking.¹ Thus unless Clement had a different text of the LXX or refers to some apocryphal book unknown to us, he did not derive the term *διάκονος* from, but only mistakenly attributed it to, *ἡ γραφή*.² It remains possible then that Clement is dependent upon Phil. 1.1 for the two connected terms.

When Clement says of the faithful (45.8) *ἔγγραφτοι ἐγένοντο ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ μνημοσύνῳ αὐτῶν*,³ he may allude to Phil. 4.3, where Paul speaks of his fellow workers *ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς*. The idea, however, is a common one, being found not only in the OT (e.g. Ex. 32.32; Is. 4.3), but also in various places in the NT (e.g. Lk. 10.20; Heb. 12.23; Rev. 3.5). Thus it is improbable that Clement here depends on Philipians.

In Cl. 48.6 the words *ζητεῖν τὸ κοινωφελὲς πᾶσιν, καὶ μὴ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ* could possibly trace back to Phil. 2.21 *οἱ πάντες γὰρ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ζητοῦσιν, οὐ τὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, but may equally well be explained by 1 Cor. 13.5. Similarly the clause (38.2) *ἀναπληρωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὸ ὑστέρημα* could reflect Phil. 2.30 *ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα*. However, if the language be at all regarded as allusory, it may equally well be explained by 1 Cor. 16.17.

Nevertheless, it seems probable (though to somewhat lesser degree

¹ Of the seven occurrences of *διάκονος* in the LXX (only three are undisputed), none is similar to Clement's citation, and none can be used to sustain his argument. See above, p. 67.

² Lightfoot concludes that the term *διάκονος* "is due to misquotation". I, 2, 129. Irenaeus quotes the same passage—correctly—in referring to leaders of the church. *Adv. Haer.* IV, 26, 5.

³ The reading of A. C reads *αὐτοῦ* and is supported by the Syriac and Coptic (the Latin omits the sentence).

than in the previous epistles considered), that Clement was familiar with the Epistle to the Philippians.¹

4. *Colossians*

The evidence of Clement's knowledge of Colossians is slight even when compared with the few allusions to the shorter Pauline epistles already discussed. Perhaps the only possible allusion of significance is found in Clement's description of the past excellence of the Corinthian Church (2.4): ἀγὼν ἦν ὑμῖν ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς ὑπὲρ πάσης τῆς ἀδελφότητος. These words could well be a reflection of Paul's own statement in Col. 2.1: θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι ἡλίκον ἀγῶνα ἔχω ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ καὶ ὅσοι οὐχ ἑώρακαν τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐν σαρκί. Both passages speak of an ἀγὼν suffered on behalf of, ὑπὲρ, others—for Paul, not only the Colossians and Laodiceans, but all who had never seen him; for Clement, simply the whole brotherhood. The similarity of the passages makes it possible, though not necessarily probable, that Clement is alluding to Colossians.

When Clement asks in 49.2: τὸν δεσμὸν τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τίς δύναται ἐξηγήσασθαι; he may reflect his knowledge of Col. 3.14 ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγάπην, ὃ ἐστὶν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος. In the whole of the NT it is only here that love is spoken of as a bond.

Again, because of the overlapping terminology in the various Pauline epistles, it is of little consequence to note that Clement's words (32.4) σοφίας ἢ συνέσεως are found in Col. 1.9, ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ (cf. 1 Cor. 1.19). Similarly, Clement's reference to the obedience of wives (1.3) ἐν τε τῷ κανόνι τῆς ὑποταγῆς ὑπαρχούσας can be related to Col. 3.18 αἱ γυναῖκες, ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, ὡς ἀνῆκεν ἐν κυρίῳ, but also e.g. to Eph. 5.22ff., or to Tit. 2.5.

It is also difficult to trace the source of Clement's words in 59.2: δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκοτόντος εἰς φῶς, ἀπὸ ἀγνωσίας εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν δόξης ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ. The idea that Christians have been brought from darkness to light is found in Col. 1.12f.: εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί· ὃς ἑρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκοτόντος καὶ μετέσ-

¹ Lightfoot writes concerning four of these allusions: "Though each resemblance in itself is indecisive, all combined suggest at least a probability that St. Clement had seen this epistle". *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (London, 1873), p. 74. Cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 499, n. 1.

τησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ. The same idea, however, is found also in Acts 26.18 ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκοτόντος εἰς φῶς and in 1 Pet. 2.9 ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκοτόντος ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστόν αὐτοῦ φῶς. The best attested of these three epistles in Clement is probably 1 Peter, and this would seem to favour accepting Clement's passage as an allusion to 1 Peter (cf. the common verb καλέω). However, there is one further factor which argues for Colossians as the source of Clement's language. The second part of Clement's passage refers to ἐπίγνωσιν δόξης ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, and ἐπίγνωσις is prominent in the immediate context of the Colossians parallel; thus in Col. 1.9: ἵνα πληρωθῇτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (cf. 1.10 αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ). Further, τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ is found in Col. 1.11. We conclude that Clement here very possibly alludes to Colossians.

If the evidence just reviewed does not justify a conclusion of probability concerning Clement's use of Colossians, it is clear that one of strong possibility must be allowed.

5. *The Pastoral Epistles*

Although some writers do not accept the existence of literary contacts between the Pastorals and Clement's epistle,¹ P. N. Harrison² and R. Falconer³ are convinced otherwise, and have drawn up extensive lists of parallels. However, the difficulty of accepting the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, and the customary late date assigned to them has raised the question of priority and thus different conclusions have been drawn from this acknowledged literary contact. Thus Harrison⁴ and Streeter⁵ conclude that it is the Pastorals that are dependent upon Clement, rather than vice-versa.

¹ E.g. Barnett, who writes "the judgement of this study is that there are no convincing traces of acquaintance with any of the Pastorals". *Op. cit.*, p. 104. Cf. Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

² *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford, 1921), p. 177f.

³ *The Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford, 1937), p. 3f. Unfortunately, most of Falconer's suggested parallels are too general to be convincing. Cf. also J. D. James, *The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles* (London, 1906), pp. 13-15.

⁴ *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, p. 8f.

⁵ "The verbal parallels between 1 Clement and the Pastoral Epistles are just not striking enough to prove a literary connection; but they are enough to make it probable. Since, then, 1 Clement is the earlier document, it will be the editor of the Pastorals who is the borrower, of ideas as well as words". *The Primitive Church* (London, 1930), p. 153. Streeter assumes, and nowhere proves, that Clement is the earlier document.

The evidence, however, which is used to argue that the Pastorals were written *after* Clement's epistle is very tenuous: the degree of ecclesiastical organization reflected in the Pastorals is regarded as exceeding that found in Clement.¹ Falconer, however, has correctly pointed out that church organization in Clement is by no means underdeveloped, and that in the light of the importance of bishops and deacons in chapters 42 and 44, it is more difficult to believe that the Pastorals were written after Clement than before Clement.² Similarly, Beyer writes that although in Clement ἐπίσκοπος remains the equivalent of πρεσβύτερος, Clement exhibits an advanced polity in establishing the hierarchy God-Christ-apostles-bishops-deacons, and in attempting to provide OT precedent for the office of bishop and deacon.³ H. F. von Campenhausen has argued at length that Polycarp or a close contemporary of his wrote the Pastorals.⁴ In this way Campenhausen accounts not only for the many similarities between the Pastorals and Polycarp's epistle but also for the several unmistakable verbal parallels between the two which have usually been explained on the basis of Polycarp's knowledge of and dependence upon the Pastorals.⁵ Campenhausen's argument is an interesting piece of speculation, but cannot be regarded as seriously demonstrating either that Polycarp was the author of the Pastorals, or that they were written in the second century.

If the Pastorals are not from the hand of Paul, a post-95 date for them is not thereby proved; the decades between the death of Paul and the writing of Clement's epistle provide ample time for the work of a later editor. In short, it is entirely unsatisfactory to allege a post-95 date for the Pastorals in the absence of any convincing evidence supporting such an allegation, while at the same time ignoring concrete evidence in the form of acknowledged literary contacts—evidence

¹ Harrison, indeed, believes that he can pinpoint the ecclesiastical development in the Pastorals. "It may be accurately defined as more advanced than the state of things revealed in the Roman Clement, but less so than in the Ignatian Epistles". *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, p. 7.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

³ 'Επίσκοπος, *TDNT* II, 620. Cf. Westcott, *History of the Canon*, p. 27.

⁴ *Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe*, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1951.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 28ff. No mention is made of the parallels between Clement and the Pastorals. Presumably they would be accounted for by saying that just as Polycarp's *Philippians* shows dependence upon Clement, so also would the Pastoral epistles if they were written by him.

which, taken at face value, indicates Clement's knowledge of the Pastorals. This evidence cannot be taken to support the priority of Clement without a more convincing argument for that priority on other grounds.

The possible allusions to *1 Timothy* in Clement's epistle are numerous. Individually they are not very convincing; taken together, however, they establish a probability that Clement knew and was influenced by *1 Timothy*.

Perhaps the following are the most convincing allusions. The words of Cl. 7.3, *τί καλὸν καὶ τί τερπνὸν καὶ τί προσδεκτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς* are very possibly reminiscent of *1 Tim.* 2.3 *τοῦτο καλὸν καὶ ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*. (Cf. *1 Tim.* 5.4 *τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*.) The necessity of being approved prior to ministry is found in Cl. 42.4, *δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν*, and in *1 Tim.* 3.10, *καὶ οὗτοι δὲ δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον, εἴτα διακονείτωσαν*. The possibility of a connection between Clement's passage and that of *1 Timothy* is considerably strengthened by the fact that Clement's final words *τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν* are found verbatim in *1 Tim.* 1.16. When Clement writes in 29.1 *προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἀγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἶροντες πρὸς αὐτόν* (cf. also 2.3), he could reflect the words of *1 Tim.* 2.8: *βούλομαι οὖν προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας*, although the words are not particularly unusual, reflecting, as they do, the then common position of prayer. In Clement's long prayer towards the end of his epistle, he writes (61.2): *σὺ γάρ, δέσποτα ἐπουράνιε, βασιλεῦ τῶν αἰώνων*. The last three words could conceivably have been derived from the doxology of *1 Tim.* 1.17 which begins *τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων*, but the phrase occurs in *Tobit* 13.7,11 and in the κ^* and C MSS of *Rev.* 15.3, and was probably also common in the Jewish liturgy. It is interesting to note that in the prayer of 61.1-2 (cf. also 60.4) Clement is fulfilling the urgent request expressed in *1 Tim.* 2.1-2.

Among further possible allusions, Clement's *μὴ κατὰ προσκλίσεις* (21.7; cf. *δίχα προσκλίσεως* of 50.2) is possibly to be related to words of *1 Tim.* 5.21: *μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ πρόσκλισιν*. The words of Cl. 60.4 *ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ* are found verbatim in *1 Tim.* 2.7, but with different referents. The *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ* of Clement is perhaps, with Lightfoot, to be taken with *ἐπικαλουμένων* as an allusion to the LXX of *Ps.* 144.18. But the addition of *πίστει*, and the order *πίστει καὶ ἀλη-*

θεία could possibly be due to the influence of 1 Tim. 2.7. In Cl. 33.7: ἴδωμεν, ὅτι ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς πάντες ἐκοσμήθησαν οἱ δίκαιοι, καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος ἔργοις ἑαυτὸν κοσμήσας ἐχάρη, is possibly reminiscent of 1 Tim. 2.9f., where women are exhorted κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς ... δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν. Clement's reference to the conduct of women in 1.3 could betray a knowledge of this same passage in 1 Timothy. On the other hand, the presence of similar instruction in 1 Pet. 3.1ff. may point to a common catechetical tradition as the source of the passage. When Clement in 1.3 speaks of τιμὴν τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς παρ' ὑμῖν πρεσβυτέροις he may reflect the passage in 1 Tim. 5.17 οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν. The words of Cl. 2.1 τοῖς ἐφοδίοις τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρκοῦμενοι bear a certain similarity to those of 1 Tim. 6.8 ἔχοντες δὲ διατροφὰς καὶ σκεπάσματα, τούτοις ἀρκεσθυσόμεθα. A similarity can also be seen between Cl. 51.3 ὡν τὸ κρίμα πρόδηλον ἐγενήθη and 1 Tim. 5.24f., τινῶν ἀνθρώπων αἱ ἀμαρτίαι πρόδηλοι εἰσιν προάγουσαι εἰς κρίσιν.

Among the possible contacts to be seen in shorter phrases and single words, the following may be mentioned. In Cl. 41.1 ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων, possibly reflects 1 Tim. 1.19 ἔχων ... ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν (cf. 1 Tim. 1.5 ἀγάπη ἐκ ... συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς), but the same expression is found also in 1 Pet. 3.16, 21 and Acts 23.1. The phrase τοῖς ἰδίῳις καιροῖς in Cl. 20.4 (cf. τὸν ἴδιον καιρόν, 20.10) is also found (καιροῖς ἰδίῳις) in 1 Tim. 2.6, in 6.15, and also in Tit. 1.3. Clement's reference to Paul as κῆρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει (5.6) could reflect one of the two places where the term κῆρυξ is applied to Paul in the words εἰς ὃ ἐτέθη ἐγὼ κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος, 1 Tim. 2.7 and 2 Tim. 1.11. Finally, the verb στρατεύομαι of Cl. 37.1f. is found in 1 Tim. 1.18 and 2 Tim. 2.3f., but also in several other places in the NT; and Clement's σεμνότητι (41.1), found in a sentence containing a possible allusion already mentioned (ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει), is found in 1 Tim. 2.2 and 3.4 (the third and last NT occurrence is Tit. 2.7).

Turning to 2 Timothy, it will be seen that the possible allusions to this shorter epistle are not nearly so numerous by comparison. Clement's stress on the handing down of authority from one generation to another is evident from this passage in 44.2: κατέστησαν [οἱ ἀπόστολοι] τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομήν δεδώκασιν, ὅπως εἰὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Very similar in concept are the words of 2 Tim. 2.2:

ἀ ἡκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων, ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οἵτινες ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται καὶ ἑτέρους διδάξαι. It is possible that this passage was in Clement's mind as he wrote. When Clement refers to τὰς ἱερὰς γραφάς (45.2; 53.1), an expression not found in the NT, he may reflect a knowledge of the ἱερὰ γράμματα found in 2 Tim. 3.15. This possibility is perhaps strengthened somewhat by the fact that Clement's amplification of the phrase as τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ (53.1) and διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου (45.2) is not unlike the description of γραφή as θεόπνευστος in 2 Tim. 3.16. Clement's words in 45.7 τῶν ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει λατρευόντων τῷ παναρέτῳ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, are possibly reminiscent of 2 Tim. 1.3: τῷ θεῷ ᾧ λατρεύω ἀπὸ προγόνων ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει. The words ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει are also found in 1 Tim. 3.9, but not in connection with the verb λατρεύω. In 30.1, Clement's words φεύγοντες ... νεωτερισμοὺς καὶ βδελυκτὰς ἐπιθυμίας strongly resemble those of 2 Tim. 2.22: τὰς δὲ νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας φεύγε. Further, Clement's exhortation (27.3), ἀναζωπυρῆσάτω οὖν ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν with its rather rare verb (hapax legomenon in the NT) very possibly reflects 2 Tim. 1.6 ἀναμνήσκω σε ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ. When Clement writes of the blessed presbyters (44.5) οἵτινες ἔγκαρπον καὶ τελείαν ἔσχον τὴν ἀνάλυσιν, he possibly reflects the use of ἀνάλυσις (a hapax legomenon in the NT) in 2 Tim. 4.6 ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀναλύσεώς μου ἐφέστηκεν.

There are a few additional possibilities, but these are more convincingly explained as allusions to parallels found in other NT books. Thus while Clement's ἀλαζονείας and ὑπερηφανίας (16.2) are found in 2 Tim. 3.2, they are also paralleled in Rom. 1.30; Clement's ἔτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν (2.7) is paralleled in 2 Tim. 2.31, but more closely so in Tit. 3.1; and Clement's οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀδύνατον παρὰ τῷ θεῷ εἰ μὴ τὸ ψεύσασθαι (27.2) is paralleled in 2 Tim. 2.12 (cf. Tit. 1.2), but more convincingly in Heb. 6.18. If Clement's κῆρυξ (5.6) is an allusion to the Pastorals, it cannot be determined whether it is due to 1 Tim. 2.7 or 2 Tim. 2.5.

The very short epistle *Titus* is possibly alluded to by Clement in only a few places. Perhaps the most convincing of these is found in Cl. 1.3, with which may be compared Tit. 2.4f.

Clement 1.3

νέοις τε μέτρια καὶ σεμνὰ
νοεῖν ἐπετρέπετε ·
γυναῖξιν τε ἐν ἀμώμῳ
καὶ σεμνῇ καὶ ἀγνῇ συνειδήσει

Titus 2

4, ἵνα σωφρονίζωσιν τὰς νέας

5, ἀγνάς

πάντα ἐπιτελεῖν παρηγγέλλετε,	
στεργούσας καθηκόντως τοὺς ἀνδρας ἑαυτῶν ·	4, φιλάνδρους εἶναι
ἔν τε τῷ κανόνι τῆς ὑποταγῆς ὑπαρχούσας	5, ὑποτασσομένας τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν
τὰ κατὰ τὸν οἶκον σεμνῶς	
οἰκουρεῖν ἐδιδάσκετε,	5, οἰκουρούς
πάνυ σωφρονούσας.	5, σώφρονας

While the parallels in Titus do not occur in exactly the same sequence, they are nonetheless impressive. Especially significant is the fact that Clement's *οἰκουρεῖν*¹ and its parallel in Titus, *οἰκουρούς*, are found nowhere in the LXX or Apocrypha, and nowhere else in the NT and Apostolic Fathers.² The agreement in this uncommon word together with the other similarities of the two passages makes it probable that Clement is dependent upon Titus.³ At the same time, the subject matter of the passages suggests the possibility of an underlying catechesis common to both Clement and Titus.⁴

As we have already argued,⁵ Tit. 3.1 *πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐτοίμους εἶναι* is the closest of the various NT parallels to Cl. 2.7 *ἔτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν* (cf. also 34.4; 33.1). Moreover, the first part of the same verse in Titus, *ὑπομίμνησκε αὐτοὺς ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι* is comparable to Cl. 1.3 *ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν*.

Among further possibilities the following deserve mention. Clement writes in 42.4 *κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν ... εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους*. This is quite similar to Tit. 1.5 [ἵνα] *καταστήσης κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους*, which passage Clement may have recalled and employed in his description

¹ For *οἰκουρεῖν*, C reads *οἰκουεῖν*, but apparently the γ has been erased. The gap is plainly evident in the autotype of the MS. See Lightfoot I, 1, 426. A similar correction, *οἰκουρούς* to the more classical *οἰκουρούς*, occurs in Tit. 2.5 according to the Textus Receptus and late MSS of the NT. A. Souter notes that Clement's *οἰκουρεῖν* may possibly support the *οἰκουρούς* of the better NT MSS. *The Text and Canon of the NT* (London, 1913), p. 76.

² Lightfoot calls attention to the word *οἰκουρός* used in a similar connection in Philo, *de Execr.* 4.

³ The Oxford Committee concludes that the agreement "cannot well be accounted for by chance, and makes it probable that the one writer is dependent on the other". *NTAF*, p. 51.

⁴ Carlyle appends a personal conjecture that Clement and Titus are dependent on such a common source, "some manual of directions for the moral life". *Ibid.* This is also the opinion of Knoch who accounts for the majority of the parallels between Clement and the Pastorals on the basis of common tradition. *Op. cit.*, p. 87f.

⁵ See above, p. 211. Grant has suggested the possibility that the saying "may be proverbial" *AF* II, 20.

of the work of the apostles. The statement in Cl. 32.3: πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθησαν οὐ δι' αὐτῶν ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἢ τῆς δικαιοπραγίας ἧς κατειργάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ is very similar to Tit. 3.5 οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς. In Cl. 64.1 the words λαὸν περιούσιον could possibly be due to the influence of the same words in Tit. 2.14, but are more probably an allusion to the LXX of Dt. 14.2 καὶ σε ἐξελέξατο κύριος ὁ θεός σου γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον (the expression is found also in Dt. 7.6; 26.18; Ex. 19.5; 23.22). Finally, in Cl. 26.1 the words πίστεως ἀγαθῆς are possibly derived from the πίστιν ... ἀγαθὴν of Tit. 2.10.

In the possible allusions to the Pastoral Epistles—as indeed in all possible allusions—allowance must be made for agreement in phraseology due to the common language of first century Christianity.¹ Some of the possible allusions to the Pastorals which we have set forth may no doubt thus be explained, as can many more which we have thought too general to be mentioned. With the Pastoral Epistles this problem is intensified because of the overlapping of purpose with that of Clement's epistle, especially in the stress put upon ecclesiastical order, but also in the repeated exhortation to conduct befitting those who belong to Christ. A common ethical catechesis may well account for a number of the parallels. However, even when allowance is made for such agreement, it seems improbable that all the allusions are to be explained in this way.² Thus on the basis of the evidence cited, our conclusion is that Clement probably knew and made use of 1 Timothy and Titus; for Clement's knowledge of 2 Timothy, however, the evidence is less convincing and justifies not more than a conclusion of possible dependence.

The evidence for Clement's knowledge of the Pauline Epistles

¹ Harrison has shown, for example, that of the 175 hapax legomena in the Pastorals, 21 are found in Clement (an additional 42 non-Pauline words are found in Clement and the Pastorals). *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, p. 150. Harrison writes "In the great majority of cases these appear not in any sense as possible quotations from the Pastorals, but in a distinct context of their own, proving that they did in fact belong to the current speech of the Church and to the working vocabulary of Christian writers and thinkers in this period". *Ibid.*, p. 68.

² J. N. D. Kelly is correct when, speaking of the parallels between Clement and the Pastorals, he concludes that "only excessive caution refuses to admit direct dependence". *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (London, 1963), p. 3. Cf. J. Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the NT*, p. 418.

has now been fully reviewed. There is no trace in Clement of a knowledge of 1 and 2 Thessalonians¹ or the Epistle to Philemon. These particular epistles, however, because of their brevity, as well as their peculiar purpose and content, do not lend themselves quite so readily to quotation as do other Pauline Epistles. The evidence, to sum up, points to Clement's knowledge of the following Pauline Epistles: Romans, 1 Corinthians, (2 Corinthians), Galatians, Ephesians, Philip-
 pians, (Colossians), 1 Timothy, (2 Timothy), Titus. Only for the first two books have we certain knowledge; for the others we must be content with various degrees of probability, and for those in parentheses with mere possibility. Clement thus provides us with indications that the greater part, if not the whole, of the Pauline corpus was probably known to him and was present to his mind as he wrote in c. 95 AD.

¹ A few slight parallels between 1 Thessalonians and Clement can be adduced, but these are too general to be of any consequence. Cf. 1 Thes. 1.5 *ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πληροφορία πολλῇ* with Cl. 42.3 *μετὰ πληροφορίας πνεύματος ἁγίου*; 1 Thes. 2.10 *ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως* with Cl. 44.4 *ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως*; 1 Thes. 5.23 *ἀμέμπτως ... τηρηθεῖν* with Cl. 44.6 *ἀμέμπτως ... τετιμημένης* (emended to *τετηρημένης* by Lightfoot).

CHAPTER SEVEN

CLEMENT'S KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS

Although for the most part there is not much evidence which indicates Clement's knowledge of the Catholic Epistles, the Johannine writings, and the Acts of the Apostles, such evidence as does exist is worth serious consideration, especially in view of various claims which have occasionally been made in the past.

In the case of the Catholic Epistles and Clement, the presence of traditional materials, primarily catechetical or liturgical in character, complicates the question of direct relationship. This is a problem already encountered to some extent in our discussion of Hebrews and the Pastorals, but which is especially prominent in the epistles of James and 1 Peter.¹ While the relationship between the latter two epistles has not been finally determined,² some of the parallel material, at least, is probably to be accounted for on the basis of a shared tradition. The same holds true for Clement's relationship to these two epistles. Nevertheless in what follows, the more apparent verbal parallels are examined for any indications they may provide for the probability or improbability of literary dependence.

¹ Beyschlag calls attention to this in the following words: "Die Erkenntnis, dass Apostolische Väter und kath. Briefe des Neuen Testaments einen vorwiegend gemeinsamen Traditionshintergrund haben, setzt sich mehr und mehr durch". *Clemens Romanus und der Frühkatholizismus*, p. 30, n. 1.

² The parallels are conveniently displayed in F. Spitta. *Der Brief des Jakobus* (Göttingen, 1896), p. 184ff. The parallels are striking enough that most writers allow literary dependence. Some however allege the priority of James (e.g. Spitta, Meyer, Hort, Mayor); some the priority of 1 Peter (e.g. Bigg, Wand). Others, however, are not convinced of literary dependence either way, and attribute the similarities instead to the common use of paraenetic tradition as found in the preaching of the Jewish-Hellenistic synagogue and of the early Christians. See M. Dibelius, *Der Brief des Jakobus*⁷, Meyer Kommentar (Göttingen, 1921), p. 29f; J. H. Ropes, *Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1916), p. 22f; Knoch, *Eigenart und Bedeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufbau des ersten Clemensbriefes*, pp. 92-98; K. Beyschlag, *op. cit.*, p. 30; W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the NT* (London, 1966), p. 289; Cf. E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of Peter* (London, 1946), pp. 417f., 392f., 462; P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism* (Cambridge, 1940), pp. 23-44.

A. 1 PETER

Since the Catholic Epistles are short epistles the probability of extensive allusion diminishes. For this reason the evidence for Clement's knowledge of 1 Peter is the more conspicuous.

One of the most impressive of probable allusions to 1 Peter is found in Cl. 7.2ff. :

διὸ ἀπολείπωμεν τὰς κενὰς καὶ ματαίας φροντίδας, καὶ ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐκλεῆ καὶ σεμνὸν τῆς παραδόσεως ἡμῶν κανόνα ... ἀπενίσσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ γινώμεν ὡς ἔστιν τίμιον τῷ θεῷ [καὶ πατρὶ] αὐτοῦ, ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχύθεν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ὑπήνεγκεν ¹.

These words may be compared with the similar passage in 1 Pet. 1.18f., εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου, ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ. The parallels between these two passages are striking. With Clement's *ματαίας φροντίδας* may be compared *ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς* of 1 Peter. Clement's *τὸν εὐκλεῆ καὶ σεμνὸν τῆς παραδόσεως ἡμῶν κανόνα* provides an interesting contrast to 1 Peter's *τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου*. The main agreement is of course the common reference to *τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and most significantly the common use of the adjective *τίμιος* in speaking of the blood of Christ. Lastly, in both passages the blood of Christ accomplishes deliverance: 1 Peter, *ἐλυτρώθητε*; Clement, *διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν*. The Oxford Committee is right in pointing out that the idea of redemption through the blood of Christ was probably a common one among Christians.² Nonetheless it is difficult to believe that the particular similarities which have been enumerated are due entirely to coincidence. Rather, it seems probable that Clement is here alluding to 1 Peter.

Such a conclusion is strengthened by further evidence which seems to indicate Clement's knowledge of 1 Peter. Especially significant are the words *ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν* (49.5) found in the midst of Clement's panegyric on love. This aphorism is found verbatim in 1 Pet. 4.8, but differs from both the LXX and MT of Pr. 10.12 which is probably to be regarded as its ultimate source.

¹ For τῷ θεῷ [καὶ πατρὶ] αὐτοῦ of A (the suggestion of καὶ πατρ for the lacuna is Lightfoot's), C reads τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ. The Latin, supported by both Syriac and Coptic, reads simply *patri eius*.

² NTAF, p. 55.

<i>Clement 49.5</i> (= 1 Pet. 4.8)	<i>Proverbs 10.12 (LXX)</i>	<i>Proverbs 10.12</i> (MT)	<i>James 5.20</i>
	μῖσος ἐγείρει νεῖκος, πάντας δὲ τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας		ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁματωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐκ θανάτου
ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.	καλύπτει φιλία.	וְעַל כָּל-פְּשָׁעִים תִּכְסֶּה אֲהָבָה׃	καὶ καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.

Clement cannot have derived the aphorism from the LXX where a completely different idea is propounded. Moreover the aphorism differs from the Hebrew in the substitution of *πλῆθος* for כָּל. In the final words of the Epistle of James the same aphorism appears in a somewhat mutated form, the verb occurring in the future tense and the subject being not *ἀγάπη* but the person who, acting in love, restores a sinner to repentance. Whatever may be said about the source of the aphorism in 1 Peter (or James), the verbatim agreement between Clement and 1 Peter naturally suggests the conclusion that Clement is dependent on 1 Peter.

However, the fact that the saying is found not only in 1 Peter and Clement but also in James (albeit with variations) suggests the possibility that all three are dependent upon a common source. Moreover, the saying is found elsewhere in the literature of the early Church, in verbatim agreement with 1 Peter and Clement: e.g. 2 Cl. 16.4; Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 3, 3; *Paedagogos* III, 12, 91; and *Quis dives salvetur* 38.1), and *Didascalia Apostolorum* II, 3. Resch, determined as always to argue the existence of a pre-Synoptic collection of Logia Jesu, called special attention to the fact that in *Paedagogos* III, 12, 91, the saying is connected with a canonical saying of Jesus (= Mk. 12.17 and parallels), and that in the *Didascalia* it is introduced with the Syriac equivalent of λέγει κύριος. He accordingly concluded that most, if not all of the occurrences of the saying in the patristic literature were to be traced back not to 1 Peter, but to a pre-canonical collection of the sayings of Jesus.¹ Ropes, however, correctly pointed out that this argument could not stand since in the *Paedagogos* quotations from all parts of the Bible were irrespectively

¹ *Agrapha*¹, p. 248f. In his second edition Resch admits his earlier error (because of de Lagarde's faulty translation he had failed to note that immediately prior to our saying in the *Didascalia*, words from Pr. 15.1 were cited under the same formula [the Lord says]), but still allows the possibility that the saying traces back to Jesus. *Agrapha*², p. 310f.

linked together, and in the *Didascalia* the same introductory formula (= λέγει κύριος) was used for OT passages as well.¹ The Oxford Committee alternatively suggested that Clement and 1 Peter were dependent upon some other unknown source in the form of "another Greek version of the passage in Proverbs, or some Apocryphal writing".² But however attractive the suggestion of dependence upon a common source may be, it is by no means necessary, nor is it demonstrable that such is the case. Whatever may be the true relationship between 1 Peter and James, and whatever may be the ultimate source of our saying, there is no reason which necessitates denial of the simple conclusion that, as found in Clement (and in the later writings as well), it is dependent upon 1 Pet. 4.8. Indeed, with such evidence as we have, this appears the most probable solution.³

A very similar phenomenon occurs in Cl. 30.2 where again a citation from the LXX of Pr. 3.34 is found in practically verbatim agreement with the same citation in 1 Pet. 5.5 and Jas. 4.6. The words of Cl. 30.2 are : θεός γάρ, φησίν, ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν. With this 1 Pet. 5.5 and Jas. 4.6 agree exactly except for the omission of γάρ φησίν, and the inclusion of the definite article before θεός. The LXX of Pr. 3.34 agrees with 1 Peter and James except that for ὁ θεός it has κύριος. It is significant that 1 Peter, James, and Clement agree in the substitution of θεός for the LXX's κύριος. The problem thus presented is exactly analogous to that discussed under the previous citation, involving the question of the relationship which exists between the three documents. Again, Resch listed the occurrences of the saying in the early Church (Ignatius to the Eph. 5.3 [only the first half of the citation]; Pseudo-Ignatius to the Ephesians 5; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* III, 49, 2; and Ephraem Syrus; all of whom have ὁ θεός against the LXX's κύριος) and

¹ *Die Sprüche Jesu*, p. 75f. But Ropes himself can say little more about the saying than that "die eigentliche Geschichte des Spruches ist schwer zu ermitteln". *Ibid.*, p. 76.

² *NTAF*, p. 57. Selwyn suggests a proverb or *verbum Christi* current in the Church. *Op. cit.*, p. 463.

³ Even Knoch, somewhat surprisingly, writes that while the common use of an apocryphon or paraenetic source is not excluded, "Immerhin ist es möglich, ja vielleicht am einfachsten, um die Gemeinsamkeiten zu erklären, anzunehmen, dass Cl. diesen Stoff im Anschluss an 1 Petr. benützte". *Op. cit.*, p. 96. This may well be the case more often than Knoch is willing to admit. Moffatt also refers to the possibility of a common source, but wisely concludes that "this supposition is needless in view of the other evidence [of Clement's use of the Epistle]". *An Introduction to the Literature of the NT* (Edinburgh, 1911), p. 336. Cf. W. K. L. Clarke, *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*, p. 36.

concluded, primarily on the basis of the context of the saying in Ephraem, that the saying with the variant $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ was to be traced back to Jesus himself.¹ The evidence for Resch's conclusion is insufficient, however, and the origin of the variant $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ can no longer be determined.² Whether this variant began with James or 1 Peter,³ or earlier, it seems probable that Clement has derived the saying from 1 Pet. 5.5. Indeed, it seems evident from the context that Clement has 1 Peter in mind.⁴ Immediately prior to our saying, Clement writes: $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\ \mu\epsilon\rho\iota\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\eta\acute{\iota}\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\alpha\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha,\ \phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma,\ \mu\iota\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\pi\lambda\omicron\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma,\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \nu\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \beta\delta\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\theta\upsilon\mu\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma,\ \mu\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \mu\omicron\iota\chi\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu,\ \beta\delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\lambda\upsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\eta\phi\alpha\acute{\nu}\iota\alpha\nu.$ With this may be compared two passages in 1 Peter: 1.15f., $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi\acute{\eta}\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\theta\eta\tau\epsilon,\ \delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota\ [\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota]\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon,\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma,$ and 2.1 $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\ \delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \upsilon\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \phi\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma.$ In the first of these passages the same rationale is given for holy conduct: since the one to whom we belong is holy, so ought we to live in holiness. In the second passage the negative aspect of holy living is stressed in the same way as in Clement (cf. $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$ with $\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$), and also to be noted is the common reference to the rather rare word $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\alpha\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}$.⁵ These further allusions

¹ *Agapha*¹, p. 131f., 247. In his more cautious second edition, Resch allows his suggestion as a mere possibility. *Agapha*², p. 199. Ropes apparently does not consider the passage worth mentioning in his *Die Sprüche Jesu*.

² The MT of Pr. 3.34 supports neither $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ nor $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, having the simple pronoun $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$.

³ On the basis of contexts, Beare suggests that James is dependent on 1 Peter for the quotation. *The First Epistle of Peter* (Oxford, 1961), p. 176.

⁴ Contra F. Spitta, who writes in connection with our saying: "In dieser Beziehung kann ich nun eine Ähnlichkeit zwischen Klemens und Petrus nicht entdecken". *Op. cit.*, p. 232. In our opinion the contextual parallels between Clement and 1 Peter are more convincing than those between Clement and James adduced by Spitta. Knoch, however, explains the presence of the citation in James, 1 Peter, and Clement as due to "eine gemeinchristliche Paränese, die ihren Grund in einer jüdischen Vorlage haben dürfte". *Op. cit.*, p. 94. Cf. Selwyn, *op. cit.*, p. 418.

⁵ The Oxford Committee minimizes the importance of 1 Pet. 2.1 as a parallel, concluding that "the subject of Clement's passage [i.e. 30.1] is probably suggested by the quotation from Deuteronomy, contained in the previous chapter". *NTAF*, p. 56. However, it is by no means easy to see how the interesting quotation in Cl. 29.3 (see above, p. 74f.) can account for the particular formulation of 30.1. Moreover, the Committee's suggestion that Cl. 30.2 is a quotation of Pr. 3.34 does not account for the variant $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$.

to 1 Peter in the immediate context add to the probability that the saying in Cl. 30.2 is derived from 1 Pet. 5.5.¹

Clement's phraseology in 59.2 is paralleled in no less than three NT passages.

Cl. 59.2 - δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς

1 Pet. 2.9 - τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ
φῶς

Acts 26.18 - τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς

Col. 1.12f. - εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί · ὃς ἔρρύ-
σατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς
τὴν βασιλείαν

(cf. Is. 42.16 - ποιήσω αὐτοῖς τὸ σκότος εἰς φῶς)

Although the Colossians parallel is at first glance the most unlikely source for the metaphor, there are contextual indications which make it a strong possibility.² Acts too, though poorly attested in Clement, remains a possibility. A strong argument, however, that Clement's clause is derived from 1 Peter is found in the verb *καλέω* common to both passages. Thus there is also a strong possibility that Clement is here alluding to 1 Peter. It cannot be finally determined, however, which NT passage Clement is dependent upon; indeed, since the metaphor is found in the LXX, and was doubtless in common usage among first century Christians, it is possible that Clement is not dependent upon any of the NT parallels.³

The same metaphor, in somewhat altered form, is found in Cl. 36.2 where, however, it may well be that the text of both Greek MSS of the epistle is corrupt. The text of Codex A reads *διὰ τούτου ἡ ἀσύνετος καὶ ἐσκοτωμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν ἀναθάλλει εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς*. For the last phrase Codex C reads *εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν φῶς*. Clement of Alexandria, however, here quoting the Roman Clement, reads simply *ἀναθάλλει εἰς τὸ φῶς* (*Stromata* IV, 110, 2). Moreover, the simple *εἰς τὸ φῶς* is supported by both Syriac and Latin trans-

The Committee makes no reference to the even more significant parallel to Cl. 30.1 found in 1 Pet. 1.15f.

¹ Clement in his injunction of 57.1, *ὑποτάγητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις* may just possibly reflect this same verse (1 Pet. 5.5), *ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις*. However, the words are so common, and the injunction so consonant with Clement's own purpose that nothing may be concluded from this similarity.

² See p. 229f.

³ Thus Knoch speaks of the dependence upon 1 Peter as "eine indirekte, über die Liturgie vermittelte". *Op. cit.*, p. 96.

lations.¹ If the *θαυμαστόν* of A and C is correct, being inadvertently omitted in a MS which genealogically lies behind Clement of Alexandria and the versions, we have an unmistakable allusion to 1 Pet. 2.9. It seems more probable, however, that *θαυμαστόν* (and eventually the *αὐτοῦ*) were added by a scribe whose mind recalled the expression in 1 Pet. 2.9. If this is the case, only a remote possibility exists that Clement here is dependent upon 1 Peter.

Clement's salutation *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ παντοκράτορος θεοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πληθυνθείη* could possibly reflect the words *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη* of 1 Pet. 1.2 (= 2 Pet. 2.2); what is striking in particular is the use of the verb *πληθυνθείη* which is found elsewhere in the NT only in the salutation of Jude 2. Despite the stereotyped, formulaic character of the salutation (e.g. *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*), the verb *πληθυνθείη* is possibly derived from 1 Peter. Further, Clement's use of the verb *παροικέω* in the salutation possibly reflects the *παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς* of 1 Pet. 1.1, and as well the *παροιμία* of 1 Pet. 1.17 and *πάροιχοι* of 1 Pet. 2.11. The same idea, however, is found in Heb. 11.13. One of the favourite terms of Clement in referring to the Church is *ποιμνιον* (16.1; 44.3; 54.2; 57.2) which occurs in the NT only in 1 Pet. 5.2f. and Acts 20 (and Lk. 12.32).

The occurrence in the two epistles of several rarely used words adds to the probability that Clement was familiar with 1 Peter.² Thus Clement shares with 1 Peter the following words which are found nowhere else in the NT: *ἀγαθοποιῶ* (1 Pet. 4.19; Cl. 2.2,7; 33.1; 34.2); *ἀδελφότης* (1 Pet. 2.17; 5.9; Cl. 2.4); *ἀπροσωπολήμπως* (1 Pet. 1.17; Cl. 1.3); *ὑπογραμμός* (1 Pet. 2.21; Cl. 5.7; 16.17; 33.8). Other rare words held in common by the two epistles are *ἄρκετός* (1 Pet. 4.3; Cl. 49.3) and *ἐπισκοπή* (1 Pet. 2.12; Cl. 50.3). All of these words are equally rare in the non-biblical literature of antiquity.³

¹ The two Coptic MSS are unfortunately deficient at this point.

² The list of words given by Bigg (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, ICC, Edinburgh, 1901, p. 8) is misleading. Four of the words do not occur in Clement's epistle at all, but are instead found in 2 Clement: *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* (2 Cl. 10.2); *ἀντίτυπος* (2 Cl. 14.3); *ἄσπιλος* (2 Cl. 8.6); *παροιμία* (2 Cl. 5.1). Foster, following Bigg, also wrongly attributes the words to the genuine epistle. *Op. cit.*, p. 181. Bigg has made a further error in stating that *ἄσπιλος* and *παροιμία* are in the NT found only in 1 Peter.

³ See Arndt and Gingrich's edition of Bauer's Wörterbuch, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT* (Chicago, 1957), for references. The Oxford Committee's remarks on *ἀγαθοποιῶ* (NTAF, p. 57), must be revised in the light of further evidence listed in Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich.

The following are worth mentioning as possible (albeit remote) allusions. Clement's reference to those who were saved in Noah's ark (9.4): *Νῶε πιστὸς εὗρεθεὶς διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν, καὶ διέσωσεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ δεσπότης τὰ εἰσελθόντα ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ζωᾷ εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν* (cf. also 7.6) could have been suggested by the mention of Noah's ark in 1 Peter 3.20: *ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατασκευαζομένης κιβωτοῦ, εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὁκτὼ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος*. It is the verb *διασώζω*, common to both Clement and 1 Peter, but lacking in the Genesis account (Gn. 6ff.), that suggests the possibility of an allusion. However, the reference to Noah may equally well have been suggested by Heb. 11.7 and the occurrence of *διασώζω*—by no means a rare word—may be fortuitous. There is a certain similarity between Clement's phrase (61.3) *τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ προστάτου τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν* and the phrase in 1 Pet. 2.25, *τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν* (cf. also Cl. 59.3, *τὸν παντὸς πνεύματος κτίστην καὶ ἐπίσκοπον*). But because the similar concept is expressed in different words, no more than the possibility of an allusion may be allowed. When Clement in his prayer links submission to rulers and leaders with the will of God (61.1) *ὑποτάσσεσθαι αὐτοῖς, μηδὲν ἐναντιούμενους τῷ θελήματί σου*, he could possibly reflect the same connection in 1 Pet. 2.13ff: *ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον ... ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ*. The idea of submission to rulers, however, is found elsewhere in the NT (e.g. Rom. 13.1ff.). The same may be said of the prayer for leaders which immediately follows in Clement. Also to be noticed is the fact that in 37.3 Clement links the terms *βασιλεὺς* and *ἡγοῦμενοι*, which are similarly linked in 1 Pet. 2.13f. Clement's *ἐκλογῆς μέρος* (29.1) possibly reflects the *γένος ἐκλεκτόν* of 1 Pet. 2.9. Further, the idea of submission to one's neighbor in Cl. 38.1 *ὑποτασσέσθω ἕκαστος τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ*, may possibly derive from the *πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις* of 1 Pet. 5.5, but more probably is to be related to Eph. 5.21 (cf. also Rom. 12.10,16). However, the next words of Cl. 38.1 *καθὼς καὶ ἐτέθη ἐν τῷ χαρίσματι αὐτοῦ* can also be related to 1 Peter (4.10) *ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα*. This would make it plausible that Clement in 38.1 is dependent upon 1 Peter were it not for the fact that the words *καθὼς καὶ ἐτέθη ἐν τῷ χαρίσματι* can also have been derived from 1 Cor. 7.7 or Rom. 12.6. Clement's *ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων* (41.1) is similar to 1 Pet. 3.16 *συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθὴν*, but the same expression occurs also in 1 Tim. 1.5,19 and in Acts 23.1.

The evidence which has been examined would seem to justify the conclusion that Clement probably made use of 1 Peter. Those who disallow this probability go too far when they claim that all of the parallels are fortuitous or can be explained on the basis of a common church tradition.¹ Doubtless some of the parallels may ultimately belong in these categories. However, it seems impossible to deny dependence in every case, especially for the more striking parallels.² There is, moreover, a strong *a priori* probability that Clement knew 1 Peter. If the word "Babylon" of 1 Pet. 5.13 stands for Rome, the epistle is probably of Roman provenance. Although the date of the epistle has been questioned,³ if it was written before 95 and bears the authority of Peter (even if indirectly), it is almost certain that the Church at Rome would have retained a copy of it, and that Clement would have been familiar with it.⁴

Some writers (e.g. Mayor, Bigg, Clarke) have detected in Clement possible allusions to 2 Peter. While these are not convincing, since they can more easily be accounted for on the basis of NT writings better attested in Clement, they may be mentioned here for the sake of completeness.

Clement could possibly allude to 2 Peter when he writes (27.4) ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύναται αὐτὰ καταστρέψαι. The same idea is found in 2 Pet. 3.5ff.: οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἑκπαλαι καὶ γῆ ... συνεστῶτα τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ ... οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσιν πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν

¹ E.g. E. Lohse, who writes "Die mannigfachen Beziehungen zwischen dem 1 Ptr und 1 Clem zeigen, dass beide Briefe auf ähnliches Traditionsgut zurückgreifen und wohl beide in der römischen Gemeinde ihren Ursprung haben. Denn die Berührungen zwischen beiden Briefen lassen sich nicht dadurch erklären, dass 1 Clem aus dem 1 Ptr zitierte". "Paränese und Kerygma im 1. Petrusbrief". *ZNTW* 45 (1954), 83.

² Knoch explains most of the parallels as resulting from common tradition. Nevertheless he considers Clement's dependence on 1 Peter probable. *Op. cit.*, p. 98.

³ P. N. Harrison, however, writes "On the whole, then the literary relations between 1 Peter and other early Christian writings [especially the Pauline epistles] seem to favour, for its origin, a date seventeen years or so after, rather than before, 1 Clement". *Poly-carp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*, p. 300. More recently, F. W. Beare has argued for a late date for 1 Peter (c. 111-112) and thus contends that evidence for alleged literary dependence can "be employed in either direction". *Op. cit.*, pp. 10, 14.

⁴ It should be remembered that Clement held Peter in high regard (cf. Cl. 5.3f.). A letter written by him, or in his name, would have been considered important by the Roman Church and by Clement himself.

ἀνθρώπων. Although the two passages share the verb συνίστημι and the instrumental ἐν λόγῳ, the similarity is not convincing enough to be conclusive. Another passage in Clement which bears certain similarities to 2 Peter is found in 35.4f.

ἡμεῖς οὖν ἀγωνισώμεθα εὐρεθῆναι ἐν τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῶν ὑπομενόντων αὐτόν, ὅπως μεταλάβωμεν τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων δωρεῶν. πῶς δὲ ἔσται τοῦτο, ἀγαπητοί; ἐὰν ἐστηρικμένη ᾖ ἡ διάνοια ἡμῶν πιστῶς πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἐὰν ἐκζητῶμεν τὰ εὐάρεστα καὶ εὐπρόσδεκτα αὐτῷ, ἐὰν ἐπιτελέσωμεν τὰ ἀνήκοντα τῇ ἀμώμῳ βουλῇσει αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθήσωμεν τῇ ὁδῷ τῆς ἀληθείας κτλ.

The tenor of this passage is quite similar to that of 2 Peter in general, and three specific parallels may be pointed out. 2 Peter 3.14 connects waiting for the promises with necessity of holy living: διό, ἀγαπητοί, ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ εὐρεθῆναι ἐν εἰρήνῃ. Yet in Clement we have ὑπομένω for προσδοκάω and if Clement is alluding to this passage, we can hardly imagine him omitting εὐρεθῆναι ἐν εἰρήνῃ. Clement's reference to the promised gifts of God is similar to 2 Pet. 1.4 δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, but the similarity is so general that no significant conclusions may be drawn. Most impressive of similarities is perhaps the reference to ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας found in 2. Pet. 2.2. Very probably, however, this expression was in common use as a description of Christianity, and thus literary dependence remains very doubtful.

In 7.6 Clement writes Νῶε ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν (the same verb is used in connection with Noah in Cl. 9.4). This is similar to and may reflect the reference to Noah in 2 Pet. 2.5 as δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα. In the following verses (2 Pet. 2.5f.), we read of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah because of ungodliness, and the salvation of the righteous man Lot. The same moral is drawn by Clement when he speaks of Sodom (not Gomorrah) and Lot in 11.1. However, in both of these instances we have mere similarity of idea—and in each the idea is so natural to the passage that there is no necessity of dependence. Gn. 19 may well explain Clement's words concerning Lot; no mention, however, is made of Noah's preaching in Gn. 6f.—it is perhaps hinted at in Heb. 11.7. Lightfoot has suggested that the description of Noah as a preacher of repentance may well be derived from the Sibylline Oracles.¹

There are a few words in Clement's epistle which are hapax legomena

¹ See his long note. I, 2, 37f.

in the NT, occurring only in 2 Peter. Thus ἐπόπτης found in Cl. 59.3 occurs also in 2 Pet. 1.16; but in Clement the word refers to God, and in 2 Peter to men. The word μῶμος in Cl. 63.1 is found also in 2 Pet. 2.13. The adjective μεγαλοπρεπής modifies the same substantive in Cl. 9.2 (τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ; the adjective occurs also in 1.2; 9.1; 19.2; 61.1; 64) and 2 Pet. 1.17 (τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης). The verb πληθυνθείη found in Clement's salutation, 2 Pet. 2.1, is not a hapax legomenon and as we have already seen is satisfactorily explained on the basis of 1 Pet. 1.2. However, all these words are well attested outside the NT,¹ and there is therefore little probability that Clement has derived any of them from 2 Peter.

Lastly may be noted the interesting similarity between words in Cl. 23.3 : οἱ λέγοντες · ταῦτα ἠκούσαμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ, γεγηράκαμεν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συνβέβηκεν, and those of 2 Pet. 3.4 : καὶ λέγοντες · ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ ; ἀφ' ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. Clement's words however form part of a larger citation which is introduced as ἡ γραφή. The same citation, with some differences, appears also in 2 Cl. 11.2 under the rubric ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος.² But since the words are introduced as ἡ γραφή—an appellation not used by Clement in referring to NT writings—and since they form part of a larger citation found also in 2 Clement, it is most probable that rather than being dependent on 2 Peter, Clement has derived the saying from a non-canonical writing, used also by the author of 2 Clement, and perhaps paraphrased by the author of 2 Peter.³

The evidence cited for Clement's knowledge of 2 Peter is unconvincing, and we accordingly conclude it improbable that Clement alludes to that epistle. There is no evidence that Clement knew of the companion epistle Jude.⁴

B. JAMES

The paucity of external evidence concerning the epistle of James

¹ For references see Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, *in loc.*

² Bigg wrongly attributes the words ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος to Clement of Rome. The expression is also found in 2 Pet. 1.19, but in another connection. *Op. cit.*, p. 210.

³ For further discussion of this passage, see p. 87f.

⁴ Bigg has indeed suggested the possibility that the words of Cl. 20.12 ὃ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ μεγαλωσύνη and Cl. 65.2 δόξα, τιμή, κράτος καὶ μεγαλωσύνη reflect Jude 25. *Op. cit.*, p. 308. But their liturgical character makes this exceedingly improbable.

(and Jude) is pointed out already in the time of Eusebius, who writes of that epistle: *ιστέον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μὲν, οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰούδα* (HE II, 23, 25). There does, however, seem to be some evidence that Clement knew and alluded to James, but again the issue is clouded by a number of factors, including the epistle's obscure date and provenance, its relation to 1 Peter,¹ and its possible utilization of a peculiar kind of Jewish-Christian paraenesis which is found also in Clement.²

Perhaps the most significant of the parallels between Clement and James is found in their common insistence on the place of good works in the Christian life. It is not only the importance of good works, as for example in Cl. 33—a matter concerning which Paul was also explicit—but the relationship between good works and righteousness before God which is in question. Not only in the futility of faith without works, but in the very examples used to illustrate the point, Clement agrees with James. Clement, indeed, knows the doctrine of justification by faith (cf. 32.4),³ and appears to combine the Pauline emphasis with that of James⁴ in 31.2: *τίνος χάριν ηὐλογήθη ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν*

¹ See above, p. 238, n. 2.

² For this view see especially M. Dibelius, *Der Brief des Jakobus*⁷, Section 4, "Literarisch Beziehungen", and Section 5, "Sprache und Stil", (pp. 25-37). Dibelius writes "Im einen parännetischen Text, der in starkem Masse Tradition weitergibt, lässt sich Abhängigkeit von anderen Schriftstellern nur mit Schwierigkeiten sicher nachweisen". p. 25. Virtually all similarities between James and other writings are explained as due to the common underlying paraenesis. On the basis of this supposition the similarities between James and Clement are the result of "nur gewisse parännetische Zusammenhänge gemeinsam". p. 31. Similarly, Knoch writes "Die Gemeinsamkeiten erklären sich vielmehr aus dem gemeinsamen Anschluss an die verchristlichte jüdisch-parännetische Tradition". *Op. cit.*, p. 95. Cf. Ropes, *Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*, p. 87. See also Kümmel, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

³ F. Spitta regards this passage as "ein ausdrücklicher Protest gegen Jakobus", *op. cit.*, p. 236.

⁴ In favour of this viewpoint, see Lightfoot I, 2, 97; followed by Grant, *AF* II, 57; cf. Westcott, *History of the Canon*, p. 25. T. F. Torrance has shown that the Pauline emphasis upon *χάρις* is largely wanting in the Apostolic Fathers. Nevertheless, Torrance somewhat overstates the contrast between the teaching of Clement and that of Paul. *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers* (Edinburgh, 1948), p. 44-55. Thus in referring to Cl. 32.3f. he says "There can be no doubt that this is Pauline language, but it cannot be understood in a Pauline fashion" (p. 50). Cf. V. Schweitzer's careful study of the question. "Glaube und Werke bei Klemens Romanus", *Theologische Quartalschrift* 85 (1903), 417-437; 547-575. Schweitzer is of the opinion that "Klemens den Glauben an Christus kennt, dass demselben die christliche Bestimmtheit nicht abgeht, dass ihm der Unterschied das christlichen und vorchristlichen Glaubens klar ist" (p. 437).

Ἀβραάμ; οὐχὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀλήθειαν διὰ πίστεως ποιήσας; In other places the emphasis of James is more clearly to be seen. Thus in 10.1 Clement writes Ἀβραάμ, ὁ φίλος προσαγορευθεὶς, πιστὸς εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν ὑπήκουον γενέσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασιν τοῦ θεοῦ, and in 10.7 διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐδόθη αὐτῷ υἱὸς ἐν γῆρᾳ, καὶ δι' ὑπακοῆς προσήνεγκεν αὐτὸν θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ πρὸς ἐν τῶν ὀρέων ὧν ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ. Speaking of the necessity that faith be accompanied by good works, James, like Clement, cites the example of Abraham (2.21ff.):

Ἀβραάμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἀνεγκας Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον; βλέπεις ὅτι ἡ πίστις συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη, καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφή ἡ λέγουσα · ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, καὶ φίλος θεοῦ ἐκλήθη.

Although the similarities between Clement and James at this point are interesting, they would not be judged significant, were it not for the fact that Clement speaks of Rahab in precisely the same terms, and Rahab provides James with his second example. Clement writes in 12.1: διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐσώθη Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη with which may be compared Jas. 2.25f.: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ὑποδεξαμένη τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ ἐτέρᾳ ὁδῷ ἐκβαλοῦσα; ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρὸν ἐστίν, οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις χωρὶς ἔργων νεκρά ἐστίν. The fact that Clement in mentioning both Abraham and Rahab stresses the combination of faith and works found in them, makes it probable that James 2 is in his mind. F. W. Young has pointed out a further interesting similarity between the accounts of Rahab found in Clement and James.¹ In both accounts Rahab is specifically said to have sent someone in the wrong direction, a point which, according to Young, is expressed neither in the OT (LXX or MT) nor in the Rabbinic and early Christian literature. The conclusion that Young draws is that only literary dependence can account for this agreement.²

Some writers, indeed, do not allow that Clement has borrowed the examples of Abraham and Rahab from James.³ Both are, of course,

Against Lightfoot's contention that Clement combines the teaching of Paul and James, see Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte*, p. 55ff.

¹ "The Relationship of 1 Clement to the Epistle of James", *JBL* 67 (1948), 339-345.

² *Ibid.*, p. 344. While allowing for the possibility of a common source, Young opts for James' dependence on Clement, since Clement's freedom with the OT better accounts for the innovation at this point.

³ E. g. Spitta, who otherwise allows Clement's dependence on James, *op. cit.*, p. 234; Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 31f.; J. Moffatt, *op. cit.*, p. 476; Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

listed in chapter 11 of the Epistle to the Hebrews—a favourite passage with Clement, as we have seen. But there they are cited as examples of faith, whereas Clement takes care to point out their good works as well. B. W. Bacon has argued that James is dependent on Hebrews for the examples, being concerned to guard against a misinterpretation of “faith”, and that Clement is, in turn, dependent upon both Hebrews and James giving, as it were, his stamp of approval upon the more balanced statement in James.¹ E. Werner has collected various Midrashic sources concerning Rahab which quite probably exercised some influence upon early Christian tradition, including the present passage in Clement.² Despite the importance of the Midrashic parallels, and although it cannot be substantiated beyond question, Clement's dependence upon James here remains a convincing possibility. Although the argument of Clement's literary dependence upon James cannot be substantiated, it remains a more cogent possibility than the conjecture that Clement's examples derive from a somewhat nebulous paraenetic tradition.

There is, however, further evidence of Clement's probable dependence on James. In Cl. 38.2 the statement *ὁ σοφὸς ἐνδεικνύσθω τὴν σοφίαν αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐν λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς* finds expression also in Jas. 3.13 *τίς σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων ἐν ὑμῖν; δειξάτω ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν πραύτητι σοφίας*. Another sentence in the same passage (Cl. 38.2), *ὁ πλούσιος ἐπιχορηγείτω τῷ πτωχῷ*, bears a certain resemblance to Jas. 2.15f: *ἐὰν ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφὴ γυμνοὶ ὑπάρχωσιν καὶ λειπόμενοι τῆς ἡμέρας τροφῆς, εἶπη δέ τις αὐτοῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν· ὑπάγετε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, θερμαίνεσθε καὶ χορτάζεσθε, μὴ δῶτε δὲ αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος, τί τὸ ὄφελος;* And with this latter passage we may also compare Cl. 30.3 *ἔργοις δικαιούμενοι, καὶ μὴ λόγοις*. However, despite some verbal contacts, the agreement between these passages is more conceptual than verbal, and thus cannot be regarded as conclusive. There is, however, a certain plausibility to the suggestion that Clement, the great admirer of Paul's writings, could not have brought himself to write the words *ἔργοις*

¹ “The Doctrine of Faith in Hebrews, James, and Clement of Rome”, *JBL* 19 (1900), 12-21. Lightfoot too writes “The instance of Rahab was doubtless suggested by Heb. 11.31; Jas. 2.25; for both these epistles were known to S. Clement and are quoted elsewhere”. I, 2, 47.

² “Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the *Prima Clementis*”, p. 806f. Werner does not deny that Clement knew James. Knoch also finds the source of the examples of Rahab in traditional material. *Op. cit.*, p. 95.

δικαιούμενοι, καὶ μὴ λόγοις had he not had an imposing authority for them, such as would be afforded by an epistle written under the name of James.¹ In 21.5 when Clement writes of foolish men ἐγκαυχωμένοις ἐν ἀλαζονείᾳ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν, he may well allude to Jas. 4.16, where the same words are found: νῦν δὲ καυχᾶσθε ἐν ταῖς ἀλαζονείαις ὑμῶν.

Several quotations common to Clement and James are occasionally used to support an argument for literary dependence between the two epistles. However, the presence of these quotations in Clement is more easily accounted for on the basis of other writings Clement had at his disposal. Thus Cl. 49.5, ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν is more probably to be explained by 1 Pet. 4.8, with which it is also in closer agreement, than by Jas. 5.20.² Similarly Cl. 30.2, θεὸς γὰρ ὑπερῆφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν, while found in Jas. 4.6, may with more probability be traced back to 1 Pet. 5.5.³ The first words of a longer quotation in Cl. 23.3, ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι, οἱ διστάζοντες τῇ ψυχῇ bear some resemblance to Jas. 1.8, ἀνὴρ δίψυχος ἀκατάστατος ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ. But James lacks the larger part of the citation which is introduced as ἡ γραφή in Clement and as ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος in 2 Cl. 11.2f. Immediately prior to the quotation in Clement, however, are further words which seem reminiscent of James (Cl. 23.1f.):

ὁ οἰκτίρμων κατὰ πάντα καὶ εὐεργετικὸς πατὴρ ἔχει σπλάγχνα ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους αὐτόν, ἥπιός τε καὶ προσηγῶς τὰς χάριτας αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῖ τοῖς προσερχομένοις αὐτῷ ἀπλῇ διανοίᾳ. διὸ μὴ δυψυχώμεν, μηδὲ ἰνδαλλέσθω ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς ὑπερβαλλούσαις καὶ ἐνδόξοις δωρεαῖς αὐτοῦ.

It may be noted, parenthetically, that the first part of this passage is similar to Jas. 5.11, καὶ τὸ τέλος κυρίου εἶδετε, ὅτι πολὺσπλαγχνός ἐστιν ὁ κύριος καὶ οἰκτίρμων. With the second part of the passage may be compared Jas. 1.5ff., αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος, καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ. αἰτείτω δὲ ἐν

¹ Thus Zahn, *GNTK* I, 962. Cf. also R. J. Knowling, *The Epistle of James* (London, 1904), p. xlix. Dibelius, however, has argued that the contrast between words and works (despite Clement's δικαιούμενοι) has nothing to do with the teaching of James. *Op. cit.*, p. 32. Knoch explains the similarity between Clement and James on this point by "einem sog. 'frühkatholischen' Verständnis des Paulus, das für die Apostolischen Väter charakteristisch ist". *Op. cit.*, p. 94. A. Meyer suggests a Jewish-Christian tradition as the basis of the agreement. *Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes* (Giessen, 1930), p. 70f.

² See above, p. 240f.

³ See above, p. 241ff.

πίστει, μηδὲν διακρινόμενος ... μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ὅτι λήμψεται τι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἀνὴρ δίψυχος, ἀκατάστατος ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ. Again, although verbal contacts are few, the similarity of the underlying idea is remarkable. Special attention is due, however, to the word *δίψυχος* which in the NT is found only in James (found again in Jas. 4.8, and also in Cl. 11.2) and *διψυχέω* in Clement. O. J. F. Seitz, who researched this root thoroughly,¹ concluded that its various occurrences in James, 1 and 2 Clement, and Hermas were to be traced back to a common source, probably the same apocryphal writing which provided the quotation of Cl. 23.3f. and 2 Cl. 11.2, and which apparently reflected the Rabbinic notion of a double heart.² Since it is not improbable that Clement derived the word *δίψυχος* from this writing, no conclusion may be drawn from the occurrence of the same word in James. Indeed, it may well be that the author of James derived the word from this same apocryphal writing, to which he appears to allude in Jas. 1.8.³

A similar phenomenon may explain the presence of the word *ἀτμίς* in both epistles. In Cl. 17.6 a quotation of words from an unknown source appears: *ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι ἀτμίς ἀπὸ κύθρας*. The saying is introduced by the words *καὶ πάλιν λέγει*, following a citation from Exodus.⁴ In Jas. 4.14 the same thought is expressed in these words *ἀτμίς γάρ ἐστε ἢ πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη, ἔπειτα καὶ ἀφανιζομένη*. It is possible that James derived this metaphor for the insignificance of life from the very writing which is quoted by Clement—perhaps the same writing from which he derived the word *δίψυχος*. Although this attractive hypothesis must remain conjectural, it is clear that the use of the word *ἀτμίς* in Clement cannot be used to substantiate Clement's dependence upon James.

There are other particular words as well that Clement and James have in common. Many of the words in Cl. 3.2, *ἐκ τούτου ζῆλος καὶ*

¹ See his "Relationship of the Shepherd of Hermas to the Epistle of James", *JBL* 63 (1944), 131-140; "Antecedents and Signification of the Term *δίψυχος*", *JBL* 66 (1947), 211-219; and "Afterthoughts on the Term 'Dipsychos'", *NTS* 4 (1957-58), 327-334, in which he weighs the evidence afforded by the Qumran materials.

² On the basis of Hermas' mention of the Book of Eldad and Modad in the context of reference to *διψυχία*, Lightfoot conjectures that the latter is in fact the source of the quotations in 1 and 2 Clement and the word itself. I, 2, 81. See above, p. 87.

³ Thus, Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 93. Ropes correctly says "there is no reason to suppose that the author of James coined the word *δίψυχος*". *Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*, p. 90.

⁴ See above, p. 88f.

φθόνος, καὶ ἔρις, καὶ στάσις, διωγμὸς καὶ ἀκαταστασία, πόλεμος καὶ αἰχμαλωσία, are found also in James. With the list just mentioned we may compare Jas. 3.16 ὅπου γὰρ ζῆλος καὶ ἐριθεία, ἐκεῖ ἀκαταστασία καὶ πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα. (In Cl. 14.1 ἀκαταστασία and ζῆλος also occur in the same clause.) In Jas. 4.2 further parallels to Clement's list are seen: *φονεύετε καὶ ζηλοῦτε... μάχεσθε καὶ πολεμεῖτε*.¹ However, since overlapping of vocabularies is naturally to be expected, the common words may not be admitted as evidence of literary dependence.

Several of the parallels cited by Mayor seem too general to be convincing,² and may well be explained as due to a common paraenesis. Three of these are asterisked by Mayor as especially convincing. Thus in 5.1 when Clement refers to τῶν ἀρχαίων ὑποδειγμάτων, and exhorts his readers to be imitators of τοὺς προφήτας in 17.1, he may reflect Jas. 5.10f., where ὑπόδειγμα is also used with reference to τοὺς προφήτας. In Jas. 5.11 Job is given as an example of patience, and Job happens also to be mentioned (but without reference to his patience) in Cl. 17.3. But there is no further similarity than this, and it is therefore not difficult to conclude that the agreement between Clement and James is fortuitous. There is an interesting parallel between the question asked in Cl. 46.5: *ἵνατί ἔρεις καὶ θυμοὶ καὶ διχοστασίαι καὶ σχίσματα πόλεμός τε ἐν ὑμῖν*; and that posed in Jas. 4.1: *πόθεν πόλεμοι καὶ πόθεν μάχαι ἐν ὑμῖν*; The question, however, is very natural in Clement's context and does not agree closely with the wording of the question in James. Most important is the fact that Clement lacks any allusion to the answer which is implied in the following words of James (cf. especially *ἡδονή* and *ἐπιθυμέω*). Clement's reference to τὰ μέλη in 46.7 is probably inspired by the Pauline epistles rather than Jas. 4.1. Cl. 35.4, *ἡμεῖς οὖν ἀγωνισώμεθα εὐρεθῆναι ἐν τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῶν ὑπομενόντων, ὅπως μεταλάβωμεν τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων δωρεῶν*, bears some similarity to Jas. 1.12, *μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ὑπομένει πειρασμόν, ὅτι δόκιμος γενόμενος λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς, ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν*.³ The paral-

¹ Many (e.g. Calvin, Spitta, Mayor, Dibelius, Moffatt) have followed Erasmus' conjecture that *φθονεῖτε* should be read for *φονεύετε*, in which case Clement's passage would be more convincing as a parallel. But in the complete lack of MS evidence for the reading, such a conjecture is precarious.

² *The Epistle of St. James*³, p. lxxf. Cf. Ropes' criticism of Mayor's list. *op. cit.*, p. 87.

³ Spitta ingeniously suggests that this passage accounts for Clement's *ὑπομένουσιν* in the citation of 34.8 (where Paul has *ἀγαπῶσιν*, 1 Cor. 2.9). *Op. cit.*, p. 236. The *ὑπομέ-*

lelism is not to be found so much in the actual wording of the passages, as in the basic thought behind them. But the connection which is here made between patience and the reception of promises was a common one in early Christianity, and accordingly no conclusion of dependence can be drawn. Nor does there seem to be any special relationship between Clement's *ἐπηγγελέμενων δωρεῶν* and the words of Jas. 1.17, *πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δῶρημα τέλειον*.

Indeed, many similarities have been pointed out between Clement's epistle and the first chapter of James. In 13.1 Clement writes *ταπεινοφρονήσωμεν οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ἀλαζονείαν καὶ τῦφος καὶ ἀφροσύνην καὶ ὀργάς, καὶ ποιήσωμεν τὸ γεγραμμένον*, (cf. also 57.2) after which follows a citation from Je. 9.23f. Similar words are found in Jas. 1.21 : *διὸ ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν καὶ περισσείαν κακίας ἐν πραύτητι δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν*. Clement's passage can, however, easily be explained by 1 Pet. 2.1 or Heb. 12.1. The Jeremiah citation itself may possibly underlie Jas. 1.9f., although the form of the two passages is rather different. Spitta sees a relationship between Cl. 19.2f. and Jas. 1.17ff., but the contacts between these passages are so few and insignificant that dependence must be regarded as most improbable. Further, the attempt which Spitta makes to link Cl. 34.7-35.4 with Jas. 1.12,15 can only be regarded as quite unconvincing.¹ Finally, the expressions (particularly the verb) used in Cl. 40.1 *ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως* and 53.1 *ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*, are similar to that used in Jas. 1.25 *ὁ δὲ παρακύψας εἰς νόμον τέλειον*. It is doubtful, however, that any significance can be found in the use of these related verbs (cf. also 1 Pet. 1.12).

We conclude then that a large number of the parallels between Clement and James which have been suggested in the past can be explained on the basis of a fund of common terminology and the use of a common paraenetic tradition. Other similarities between the two epistles may well be explained by common knowledge of, and allusion to, apocryphal writing(s) no longer extant. However, while many parallels (and supposed parallels) can be accounted for in these ways, some striking verbal agreements yet remain unaccounted for, and on

νοῦσιν, however, is much more easily explained by the reading of the LXX of Is. 64.3. See above, p. 204ff.

¹ For these attempts, see Spitta, *op. cit.*, p. 235. Unfortunately Spitta does not take space to spell out the parallels he suggests.

the basis of these we conclude the probability (although not very considerable) of literary dependence.¹

Some who give their assent to this probability have argued that it is James who is dependent on Clement, rather than vice-versa.² This argument, however, is usually made not on the basis of the data afforded by the parallels themselves, but on the basis of certain presuppositions concerning the date of James.³ But since no evidence has been produced which necessitates a post-95 date for the epistle, and since it is easier to suppose that James is the prior epistle, the most probable conclusion is that the dependence is on the part of Clement.⁴

C. Acts

Since the supposed dependence of Acts upon Josephus cannot be established,⁵ a post-95 date for Acts is by no means necessary. Accordingly, it is not an impossibility that Clement knew and made use of the Acts of the Apostles.

For the most part, however, the evidence of Clement's knowledge of Acts is not very impressive. We may begin with Clement's outline of the initial work of the apostles, in chapter 42, which reads like a summary of the history recorded in Acts. Clement writes (42.3f.)

παραγγελίας οὖν λαβόντες καὶ πληροφορηθέντες διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πιστωθέντες ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, μετὰ πληροφορίας πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐξῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ μέλλειν ἔρχεσθαι · κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν.

Virtually every phrase finds its parallel in Acts,⁶ and it may well be that Clement here reveals an acquaintance with Acts. At the same

¹ A. Meyer, who hardly underestimates the influence of traditional materials in the writings of the early Church, believed that the influence of James is detectable in Clement's epistle. *Op. cit.*, p. 72.

² E.g. F. Young, *op. cit.*, p. 345.

³ Spitta has shown the inadequacy of Holtzmann's attempt to determine priority from the parallels themselves. *Op. cit.*, p. 230ff.

⁴ For arguments against dating James in the period of the Apostolic Fathers see G. Kittel, "Die Jakobusbrief und die Apostolischen Väter", *ZNTW* 43 (1950-51), 54-112. Kittel's discussion of the relationship between Clement and James is particularly helpful in showing the priority of the latter.

⁵ See F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids, 1960), p. 24f.

⁶ Cf. especially Acts 1.2-8; 3.18; 2.4; 8.1; 14.23.

time, however, the parallels do not consist of precise agreement in wording, and are perhaps too general to justify a conclusion of literary dependence. In the words which follow this passage Clement attempts to provide scriptural justification for the appointment of bishops and deacons¹—perhaps suggested by the citation of Ps. 108.8 in Acts 1.20: τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λαβέτω ἕτερος.² Another passage which seems possibly to reflect a knowledge of Acts is found in the words of Cl. 2.2 καὶ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ἔκχυσις ἐπὶ πάντας ἐγένετο (cf. Acts 1.8; 2.4, 17f.), but again the agreement is so general as to discount a conclusion of dependence.

In chapters 4-6, Clement lists examples of those who have suffered through ζῆλος. It is particularly the examples of the martyrs Peter and Paul that are brought forward, and in this connection it is interesting to note that of the two occurrences of the word ζῆλος in Acts, once it is related to the sufferings of Peter (5.17) and once to the sufferings of Paul (13.45).

There is possibly dependence upon Acts in Cl. 5.4, where Clement speaks of Peter in these words: Πέτρον, ὃς διὰ ζῆλον ἁδικῶν οὐχ ἓνα οὐδὲ δύο, ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκεν πόνοισι, καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. Morton Smith has argued that everything here said about Peter may be accounted for if it be assumed that Clement knew Acts.³ In addition to the word ζῆλος, the fact that Peter is mentioned before Paul, and the relative amount of space given to each in Clement 5 can be explained on the basis of Acts. When Clement speaks of "not one, or two, but many afflictions", suffered by Peter it should be noted that three are reported in Acts (chapters 4, 5 and 12). Further, Clement's words ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης could possibly allude to those of Acts 12.17 ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον.⁴ However, even if the con-

¹ For a discussion of the quotation itself, see p. 67.

² Grant writes "The idea of quoting the Old Testament for apostolic succession may come to Clement from Acts 1.20, since a good deal of his material about the ministry and its history seems to come from Acts". *AF* II, 72.

³ "The Report About Peter in 1 Clement 5.4", *NTS* 7 (1960-61), 86-88. Cf. also B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 532f.

⁴ Smith, regarding the account of Peter's release in Acts 12 as modelled on the story of the resurrection of Christ, holds that the language is typological rather than literal—and therefore presumably this reference to Peter's ultimate reward need not be taken as chronological. (Peter, after all, is present in Acts 15; cf. 1 Cor. 9.5). The word *τόπος* is used similarly by Ignatius (*Magn.* 5.1), Polycarp (*Phil.* 9.2), Barnabas (19.7), and Hermas (*Sim.* IX, 27, 3), all of whom may have known Acts (cf. 1.25).

jectures be granted—i.e. that Clement's *πλείονας* can be due to "rhetorical exaggeration", and that Clement could have understood Acts 12.12-17 as referring to Peter's resurrection and ascension—the only warranted conclusion is one of possible, not probable, dependence. If Clement's dependence upon Acts at this point is uncertain, the argument (from silence) that Clement knew nothing more about Peter than what he writes in 5.4 is equally precarious.¹ The information of Cl. 5.4 may be derived from Acts, but this is not necessary, nor does it seem probable.²

In 2.1 Clement writes πάντες τε ἐταπεινοφρονεῖτε, μηδὲν ἀλαζονεύμενοι, ὑποτασσόμενοι μᾶλλον ἢ ὑποτάσσοντες, ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες, τοῖς ἐφοδίοις τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρκούμενοι. The words ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες are remarkably similar to a saying of Jesus found in Acts 20.35: μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν· μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν. At first glance it thus seems probable that Clement is alluding to this passage in Acts 20.35.³ However, the saying of Jesus recorded in this passage is nowhere to be found in the Gospels, and the particular introductory formula which is used, employing the verb *μνημονεύω*, suggests that the saying may have been part of an oral tradition that was used for catechetical purposes.⁴ The same introductory formula (slightly modified) is used to introduce sayings of Jesus in Cl. 13.1 and 46.7, and it can be argued that in these instances Clement alludes to the formula used in Acts 20.35. However, it seems more than coincidental that in all the places where the formula is used (Acts 20.35; Cl. 13.1; 46.7; Polycarp *Phil.* 2.3) the sayings of Jesus which are cited seem to come from oral tradition.⁵ This indicates that the formula, as its suitability suggests, was commonly used to introduce sayings of Jesus preserved in oral tradition. Moreover, if Clement did derive the

¹ The argument propounded by Smith has, however, shown that Peter's martyrdom at Rome cannot be argued conclusively on the basis of Cl. 5.4.

² Beyschlag has argued at length that the contents of Cl. 5 largely derive from traditional sources. *Op. cit.*, pp. 207-328.

³ Knoch writes that it "sehr wahrscheinlich erscheinen, dass er hier dieses Wort benützt". *Op. cit.*, p. 76. Cf. F. F. Bruce, who, however, allows the possibility that Clement knows the saying independently of Acts. *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

⁴ See below, p. 273. For the occurrence of this saying in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, in Anastasius of Sinai, and in Epiphanius, see Resch, *Agrapha*¹, pp. 100f; 150f. However, contrary to Resch, these late occurrences of the saying are best accounted for by dependence on Acts 20.35.

⁵ See above, pp. 135-164.

formula from Acts, it is surprising that he does not use it when he alludes to the very saying of Jesus to which it is attached in Acts. If we may regard the source of Acts 20.35 as being oral tradition, then since Clement elsewhere indicates a knowledge of sayings of Jesus derived from oral tradition (13.2; 46.8), the present allusion may independently witness to the same or similar oral tradition that lies behind the citation in Acts. It cannot therefore be concluded on the basis of Clement's words in 2.1 that he necessarily alludes to Acts 20.35—at best this remains a mere possibility.¹

More convincing evidence of Clement's knowledge of Acts is to be found in the citation in 18.1 with which we may compare Acts 13.22 and Ps. 88.21.

<i>Clement 18.1</i> (Text of A)	<i>Acts 13.22</i> (Text of Nestle-Aland)	<i>Psalms 88.21</i> (Text of Rahlfs) [1 Regn. 13.14 in brackets]
τί δὲ εἶπωμεν ἐπὶ τῷ μεμαρτυρημένῳ Δαυὶδ ; πρὸς ὃν εἶπεν ὁ θεός · εὐρον ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί,	ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα, ὃς καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας · εὐρον Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου,	εὐρον Δαυὶδ τὸν δοῦλόν μου, [καὶ ζητήσῃ κύριος ἑαυτῷ ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ] ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἀγίῳ μου ἔχρισα αὐτόν.
ἐν ἐλαίῳ αἰωνίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν.	ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου.	

From this comparison it can be seen that Clement's citation does not agree exactly with any of the parallel texts. That Clement has Ps. 88.21 in mind, however, is clear especially from the last two lines. Because of the interchange between *ε* and *αι* in the spelling of certain MSS (thus in the A text of Clement ἐλαίει = ἐλέει),² the words ἔλεος and ἔλαιον were occasionally confused.³ This probably accounts

¹ A third possibility lies in the proverbial nature of the saying. Since the saying can be paralleled in secular literature (cf. Lightfoot I, 2, 12), Clement may have derived it from a non-Christian source. Jeremias, following Haenchen, conjectures that in Acts 20.35 the saying was put into the mouth of Jesus. *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*², trans. R. H. Fuller (London, 1964), p. 32f.

² See Lightfoot I, 1, 120 for a list of such variant spellings in Codex Alexandrinus.

³ Thus in the citation of Ps. 140.5 found in Cl. 56.5, Codex A mistakenly reads ἔλεος for the LXX's ἔλαιον. Cf. the ἐν ἐλέει which immediately precedes. See Lightfoot I, 2, 164.

for Clement's use of ἐν ἐλέει with the verb χρίω, although the same combination (illustrating the same confusion) is found in the A and 8 MSS of Ps. 151.4, as well as the B MS of the passage under discussion (Ps. 88.21) where ἐλέει is found in place of ἐλαίω.¹ With the change of the substantive, the change of the adjective becomes understandable; since ἅγιος is not particularly suitable to modify ἔλεος, αἰώνιος is substituted. Thus in codices A and C of Clement's epistle, as in the Latin (*misericordia sempiterna*), we read ἐλέει αἰωνίω, words which often occur together in the LXX.² The Syriac and Coptic versions retain the original noun, but with the altered adjective giving the rather strange reading "eternal oil".³ Clement of Alexandria, who is avowedly quoting from his Roman namesake, gives the citation in verbatim agreement except for the substitution of the words ἐλαίω ἁγίω which he no doubt recalled from the LXX of Ps. 88.21 (*Stromata* IV, 107, 1).

Clement's dependence on Ps. 88.21 is plainly evident, but the words ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί cannot be accounted for on the basis of this passage. The closest approximation of these words in the OT is found in 1 Regn. 13.14 where, however, we have ἄνθρωπον for ἄνδρα (as well as αὐτοῦ for μου). But Clement's very words are found in Acts 13.22 with the only difference being the transposition of the words Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί. The influence of Acts on Clement would thus seem to be apparent from this parallel. Also to be noticed is the parallel between Clement's μεμαρτυρημένω and μαρτυρήσας in Acts, immediately prior to the citation. Question has been raised, however, by the last clause of the citation in Acts, ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου—words which appear to lack a canonical source.⁴ This may indicate that the source of the citation in Acts is to be found in a collection of Davidic or Messianic passages.⁵

¹ It is curious that whereas B preserves the correct reading in Ps. 151.4, it goes astray in the present instance. Cf. also the LXX MSS of Ps. 91.11; 100.1; and Ru. 3.10.

² Cf. ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίω in Is. 54.8; and the expression εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ, *passim*.

³ The same phenomenon is found in reverse where Codex B in Ps. 88.21 presents the altered noun with the original adjective.

⁴ The words πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου ποιήσει are found in Is. 44.28, but there they refer to Cyrus. However, such words may have been applied to David on the basis of 1 Sa. 13.14 where David, as a man after the Lord's own heart, is contrasted with Saul, to whom it is said οὐκ ἐφύλαξας ὅσα ἐνετείλατό σοι κύριος.

⁵ Cf. L. Cerfaux, "Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre des Actes", *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne*, Mélanges offerts à M. Goguel (Neuchâtel,

If this be the case, then the language of Clement's citation may reveal the influence of that same collection rather than Acts 13.22. This remains a possibility, but the simpler conclusion of dependence upon Acts is to be preferred in the present instance.¹ Clement may well have purposefully omitted the last clause of the citation in Acts, because it contradicted the penitential Psalm 50, virtually the whole of which he proceeds to quote (18.2-17). Indeed, the opening of this Psalm, ἐλέησόν με, ὁ θεός, κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σου seems best to account for the choice of Ps. 88.21 and the reading ἐν ἐλέει αἰωνίῳ ἔχρισα αὐτόν. We conclude then that it is most probable that Clement in citing Ps. 88.21 alludes, perhaps unconsciously, to Acts 13.22 and thus evidences his acquaintance with the book of Acts.²

Among other possible contacts with Acts the following deserve mention. In 14.1 Clement writes: δίκαιον οὖν καὶ ὅσιον, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑπηκόους ἡμᾶς μᾶλλον γενέσθαι τῷ θεῷ ἢ τοῖς ἐν ἀλαζονείᾳ καὶ ἀκαταστασίᾳ μυσεροῦ ζήλους ἀρχηγοῖς ἐξακολουθεῖν. The underlying thought here is the same as that of Acts 5.29: πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις. Attention should also be called to Clement's address ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, which of course occurs very frequently in Acts. It is doubtful, however, whether we can assert the probability of dependence in the present instance without a more substantial agreement in wording. Similarity in idea, rather than actual wording, can also be seen in Cl. 52.1: ἀπροσδεής, ἀδελφοί, ὁ δεσπότης ὑπάρχει τῶν ἀπάντων which is comparable to Acts 17.25 οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θεραπεύεται προσδεόμενός τινος. The sovereignty of God over the nations is expressed in Cl. 59.3 and also Acts 17.26, but again in very different words. For rather commonplace ideas as these, no probability of dependence may be claimed.

Although in Cl. 59.2 the words δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκοτόους

1950), p. 51. Grant says of the saying that "conceivably Clement took it from an anthology". *AF* II, 41. Knoch, who leans towards the view that Clement knew Acts, prefers to explain the present similar OT quotations as deriving from a Testimony Book containing messianic sayings. *Op. cit.*, p. 76. Thus also M. Wilcox, who speaks of "a 'testimony-fragment' current in the apologetico-liturgical use of the Church". *The Semitisms of Acts*, p. 23.

¹ E. Haenchen, pointing out the fact that David is one of a series of examples used by Clement, concludes that "er hat vielmehr mit dieser Reihe, wie sonst auch, ein Traditionstück übernommen, in welchem dasselbe Mischzitat wie in der Apg. vorkam". *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1961), p. 2. But this is purely conjectural, whereas the words in question are clearly found both in Acts and Clement.

² Thus also F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, p. 265.

εἰς φῶς are similar to words of Acts 26.18, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκοτίους εἰς φῶς, they are more closely paralleled by passages in Col. 1.12f. and 1 Pet. 2.9, and thus may not be used as evidence of Clement's knowledge of Acts.¹ The same may be said concerning the expression ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει (Cl. 41.1), which is paralleled in Acts 23.1, but also in 1 Tim. 1.5,19 and 1 Pet. 3.16,21. In 44.1 Clement writes καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. It is conceivable that here Clement alludes to the speech of Paul recorded in Acts 20.29f., but the prophecy of future dissension is itself not an uncommon one in the NT, being found even on the lips of Jesus (Mk. 13.22 and parallels). Nowhere, however, is it specifically connected with the office of bishop as in Clement. Clement's words in 40.4 οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιῶντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν εὐπρόσδεκτοί τε καὶ μακάριοι possibly reflect the ὁρίσας προστεταγμένους καιροὺς καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν of Acts 17.26. The expression προστετάγμενοι καιροί is particularly striking. However, the point of the two passages is very different, and this agreement may well be fortuitous. In Cl. 58.2 τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν σωζομένων διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ may be reminiscent of Acts (for σωζόμενοι see Acts 2.47; for ἀριθμός, Acts 6.7; 11.21). Again, nothing may be concluded from so general a similarity.

Lastly, certain words common to the two writings may be mentioned as possible evidence of Clement's knowledge of Acts. A favourite word of Clement, ποιμνιον (Cl. 16.1; 44.3; 54.2; 57.2) is used exactly as it is in Acts 20.28f. (but cf. 1 Peter). Clement's use of παῖς in referring to Jesus (59.2ff., twice with ἡγαπήμενος) possibly shows the influence of Acts 3.13,26; 4.27,30. Similarly, the rare word δωδεκάφυλον is found both in Cl. 55.6 and Acts 26.7; the word ἐκτένεια is found in Acts 26.7 and Clement (33.1 and 37.1); and τὸ μεγαλεῖον, which occurs in Cl. 26.1 and 49.3 (cf. 32.1), can be found in the plural in Acts 2.11. The verb ἀντοφθαλμέω is found in Cl. 34.1 and Acts 27.15 but in very different applications. Further agreements in vocabulary could be pointed out,² but since these words are found in other NT writings which Clement probably knew, they cannot contribute to

¹ See above, p. 229f. Wilcox explains this and most of the other parallels between Clement and Acts on the basis of a common fund of liturgical phraseology. *Op. cit.*, p. 73f.

² Cf. Massaux, *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu*, p. 39.

the argument. Indeed, the words which have been cited are of no value as independent evidence, and can only add plausibility to an argument already established on other grounds.

There are a number of OT citations which are found both in Clement and in Acts: Ex. 2.14 in Cl. 4.10 and Acts 7.27,35; Gn. 12.1 in Cl. 10.3 and Acts 7.3; Gn. 13.15 in Cl. 10.4,5 and Acts 7.5; Is. 53.7f. in Cl. 16.7f. and Acts 8.32f; Ps. 88.21 and 1 Sa. 13.14 in Cl. 18.1 and Acts 13.22; and Ps. 2.7f. in Cl. 36.4 and Acts 13.33. With the one important exception of Cl. 18.1, discussed above, none of these passages reveals any influence of Acts upon Clement, since in all of them the text of Clement and Acts agrees with that of the LXX.¹ The sheer number of quotations which the two writings have in common might suggest influence except that Clement constantly quotes from the OT and the passages Clement shares with Acts were certainly among the most popular of the early Church.

We conclude then that while the evidence is by no means overwhelming, the amount of common material and especially the agreement between Cl. 18.1 and Acts 13.22 seem conspicuous enough to assert the probability of Clement's knowledge of Acts.²

D. THE JOHANNINE LITERATURE

Since the Fourth Gospel, the First Epistle of John, and the Apocalypse³ probably date from the end of the first century—from approximately the same time that Clement's epistle was written—there is not much likelihood that Clement knew these writings.⁴ However,

¹ There is only one instance in these OT citations where Acts (7.3) diverges slightly from the LXX and thus where Clement might have revealed his knowledge of Acts. Clement, however, quotes from the LXX accurately (10.3).

² Streeter also allows the existence of clear reminiscences of Acts in Clement's epistle. Cf. *The Primitive Church*, p. 161. Beyschlag protests against the contention that Clement knew Acts, arguing that "der stringente Nachweis aus den Quellen mangelt". *Op. cit.*, p. 33. It is, however, admitted by all that at best the arguments point to probability and not certainty.

³ These writings are discussed together for convenience rather than because of convictions concerning unity of authorship.

⁴ W. von Loewenich has examined the question of Johannine influence in Clement's epistle, and has come to a negative conclusion: "Auf Aussagen über ein Joh. Verständnis im I. Clem. muss nach alledem verzichtet werden". *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert* (Giessen, 1932), p. 6. See also Loewenich's note 3 on page 6 for a list of various opinions concerning Clement's dependence on the Johannine literature.

possible allusions to the writings, with special attention to the Gospel of John, have been pointed out by the Dominicans R. P. Boismard¹ and F.-M. Braun,² and these possibilities among others are worthy of consideration.

1. *The Fourth Gospel*

Clement may indicate a knowledge of this Gospel when he writes in 49.1: ὁ ἔχων ἀγάπην ἐν Χριστῷ ποιησάτω τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παραγγέλματα an exhortation which is very similar to that given by Jesus in Jn. 14.15: ἐὰν ἀγαπᾷτέ με, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσετε (cf. Jn. 14.21,23).³ Yet in Clement, it is not specifically love of Christ that is spoken of, but love generally, in the spirit or power of Christ. This fact combined with Clement's use of ποιέω and παραγγέλματα lessens the probability that Clement here alludes to the Gospel. The parallel found in Jn. 15.10 ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολὰς μου τηρήσητε, μενεῖτε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου, καθὼς ἐγὼ τοῦ πατρὸς μου τὰς ἐντολὰς τετήρηκα καὶ μένω αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, partially obviates the former difficulty but agrees with Clement more in thought than in actual wording. A statement similar to Clement's occurs also in 1 Jn. 5.2f: ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκουμεν ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅταν τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπῶμεν καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ποιῶμεν. αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν, but again the agreement is not significant enough to substantiate dependence. It must be admitted, however, that Clement's exhortation is at least very Johannine in tone, and that dependence upon the Fourth Gospel in this instance remains a possibility.⁴

In 42.1f. Clement writes, οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῖν εὐηγγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξεπέμφθη · ὁ Χριστὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Behind this passage may lie the words of Jesus in Jn. 20.21 καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέν με ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ἐγὼ πέμπω ὑμᾶς or Jn. 17.18, καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

¹ "Clément de Rome et l'Évangile de Jean", *RB* 55 (1948), 376-387.

² *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l'Église Ancienne*, I (Paris, 1959), 170-180.

³ The reading τηρήσατε (Textus Receptus, D, θ), if accepted, more closely parallels Clement's imperative, ποιήσατω.

⁴ C. C. Tarelli concludes that "Clement either knew the Fourth Gospel, or knew the saying 'If ye love me, keep my commandments' from another source". "Clement of Rome and the Fourth Gospel", *JTS* 48 (1947), 208.

There is a similarity of idea here, but Clement's purpose of thus establishing the authority of bishops seems to rule out any dependence upon John at this point. Moreover, there is little agreement in actual wording; that which is common to both is the idea of continuity. Clement may have been influenced by the Fourth Gospel, but he could equally well have combined what were, after all, common ideas—that Jesus was sent by God, and the apostles by Jesus¹—and used them for his own purposes.

There are further similarities between the seventeenth chapter of John and Clement's epistle which may argue for Clement's familiarity with that portion of the Gospel. The words *ἵνα γινώσκωσιν σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν* of Jn. 17.3 may possibly be reflected in two places in Clement. In Cl. 43.6 we find the words *εἰς τὸ δοξασθῆναι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ καὶ μόνου κυρίου*.² The striking similarity is of course found in the two adjectives *ἀληθινός* and *μόνος*, both of which are frequently applied to God in the OT and in the NT, but which nowhere occur together as here. Further, it may be noted that Clement's *εἰς τὸ δοξασθῆναι τὸ ὄνομα* is paralleled in the context of Jn. 17.3 where (verses 1-6) glorification and the name of God are mentioned (cf. also Jn. 12.28).³ Despite the similarities, actual agreement in wording is minimal—Clement reverses the order of the adjectives and separates them with *καί*, and the contexts of the two passages are very different. The similarities are best explained, not by allusion, but by the common background of the writers.⁴ The second passage in Clement which resembles Jn. 17.3 is found in 59.3f. *εἰς τὸ γινώσκειν σε τὸν μόνον ὑψιστον ἐν ὑψίστοις ... γνώτωσάν σε ἅπαντα τὰ ἔθνη, ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μόνος καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ παῖς σου, καὶ ἡμεῖς λαὸς σου καὶ*

¹ Braun correctly notes that "ces deux idées sont essentielles à toute catéchèse apostolique". *Op. cit.*, p. 174.

² *Kυρίου* is the reading of C, A being deficient at this point. The Coptic and Syriac translations, however, have the equivalent of *θεοῦ*. The Latin lacks the noun completely, reading simply *nomen veri et uni*. We accept the reading *κυρίου* as the more difficult. While we cannot account for *θεοῦ* being altered to *κυρίου*, the reverse alteration is explainable by influence from Jn. 17.3. This is indicated by the Syriac which, lacking the conjunction, reads the equivalent of *τοῦ μόνου ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ*—as in Jn. 17.3. The Latin may, however, reflect the original (thus Harnack, Boismard).

³ Braun discusses at length the interconnection of *ὄνομα* and *δόξα* found both in John and Clement, and concludes that the similarity can be explained "par la diffusion d'une liturgie primitive d'esprit johannique". *Op. cit.*, p. 179.

⁴ Cf. the presence of all the elements of Clement's phraseology in Ps. 85.9-15.

πρόβατα τῆς νομῆς σου. Here the verb γινώσκω followed by the words σε τὸν μόνον as well as the sequence ὁ θεὸς μόνος καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός could conceivably be related to Jn. 17.3. However, the first agreement is slight enough to be explained as fortuitous and the second so general as to be inconsequential. Moreover, Clement's passage is filled with OT allusions which account for his language, and Clement's context is very different from that of John.¹ It is very unlikely then that influence of the Fourth Gospel is to be seen here.

A further possible allusion to Jn. 17 may be seen in Cl. 60.2, καθάρισον ἡμᾶς τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας. In Jn. 17.17 we read ἀγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ · ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν. It is particularly the fact that Clement links cleansing with ἀλήθεια that recalls the place of ἀλήθεια in John (cf. Jn. 8.32ff.). Again it is the idea rather than the actual wording that suggests the parallel.² Clement's use of καθάριζω in this connection, however, is not foreign to the Gospel (cf. Jn. 15.3). Clement elsewhere uses the word ἀλήθεια in a Johannine manner when he writes (31.2): οὐχὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀλήθειαν διὰ πίστεως ποιήσας; The expression ποιεῖν ἀλήθειαν is found in Jn. 3.21 ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς (cf. also 1 Jn. 1.6). The contexts however are so dissimilar that it is difficult to regard this agreement in concept as an allusion to the Fourth Gospel. The idea of "doing truth" is found also in Tobit 4.6 and 13.6 (cf. πορεύεσθαι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, 3 Regn. 2.4; Tobit 3.5) as well as at Qumran (1QS 1.5; 5.3; 8.2). Moreover, Clement's use of ἀλήθεια (see especially 60.4; 62.2 and 35.5) may reflect usage in NT writings with which he was familiar.³ It is improbable then that Clement's use of ἀλήθεια in these two passages indicates dependence upon the Fourth Gospel.

¹ Boismard argues that the difference in contexts is irrelevant since Clement often shows the influence of a NT writing in a common OT citation irrespective of contexts. (*Op. cit.*, p. 381f.) This ignores the fact that clear OT citations have an identity of their own and are thus much more readily separable from context than allusory words which are an intrinsic part of the text.

² This passage is regarded by Boismard as the most convincing of the parallels which he presents as evidence of Clement's dependence upon John. It is questionable, however, whether, like John, Clement means "la purification venant de la vérité, produite par la vérité" (*Op. cit.*, p. 385). Clement may be using ἀλήθεια in the sense of "righteousness" rather than the "word of God" and the genitive may therefore be descriptive. But even if Boismard's interpretation be accepted, there is no need to conclude Clement's dependence upon John (cf. the foreshadowings of John's statement in Acts 15.9; Eph. 4.24).

³ For the link between ἀλήθεια and δικαιοσύνη, see, e.g. Eph. 4.24; 5.9; 6.14. For ἀλήθεια contrasted with ἀδικία, see 1 Cor. 13.6; Rom. 1.18; 2.8. For similar Jewish usage, see Bultmann, *TDNT* I, 238-247.

Clement refers to "the flock of Christ" in 54.2: *μόνον τὸ ποίμνιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰρηνεύτω μετὰ τῶν καθεσταμένων πρεσβυτέρων*, and 57.2: *ἄμεινον γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῖν, ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μικροὺς καὶ ἐλλογίμους εὐρεθῆναι*. With Clement's expression may be compared the passages in Jn. 10.2-16, 26-28 and 21.16-17 where Christ refers to his disciples as his "sheep" (*πρόβατα*). There is a similarity here, but since Clement uses the word *ποίμνιον*—a word which is nowhere found in the Gospel of John—it is difficult to conclude Clement's dependence upon the Gospel. Clement's words in 59.4: *ἡμεῖς λαὸς σου καὶ πρόβατα τῆς νομῆς σου*, are not an allusion to the Johannine passages, but are taken directly from Ps. 99.3. If Clement's reference to *τὸ ποίμνιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ* is allusory at all, it may more plausibly be traced to 1 Pet. 5.2f. or Acts 20.28, but there are also OT antecedents (cf. *τὸ ποίμνιον κυρίου*, Je. 13.17; Zc. 10.3).¹

When Clement writes in 48.4, *πολλῶν οὖν πυλῶν ἀνεωγνυῶν, ἡ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ ἐν ᾗ μακάριοι πάντες οἱ εἰσελθόντες* he could possibly reflect a knowledge of Jn. 10.9 *ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα· δι' ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσέλθῃ, σωθήσεται*. Clement, however, has *πύλη* for *θύρα*, and more probably is alluding to Ps. 117.19f., where the expression *πύλας δικαιοσύνης* occurs.

Clement appears to reflect the soteriology of the Fourth Gospel when he writes in 49.6 *τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἐν θελήματι θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν* (cf. 21.6). This is very similar to the words of Jesus in Jn. 6.51 *καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς*. The agreement, however, is by no means close enough to justify a conclusion of literary dependence. It is best explained as a reflection of the kerygma common to the early Church, which made good use of the 53rd chapter of Isaiah (cf. Cl. 16; Jn. 1.29).²

Further similarities between Clement and the Fourth Gospel which can be pointed out are general enough to be explained in the same way.³

¹ Braun writes "Une dépendance de Clément par rapport au symbolisme adopté par nos deux auteurs est d'autant plus probable qu'en dehors d'eux l'Eglise n'est jamais représentée comme le troupeau du Christ". *Op. cit.*, p. 177. Braun ignores not only the OT antecedents, but also such passages as Heb. 13.20 and Lk. 12.32.

² See Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 92ff.

³ Braun explains the general similarities between Clement and John by concluding that "la communauté romaine était en possession d'une théologie apparantée à celle de Jean, et elle en vivait". *Op. cit.*, p. 180. Grant similarly concludes "Both reflect a kind

Some of the similarities which have been discussed, however, are impressive and deserve consideration as possibilities. But in every case significant agreement in wording was seen to be lacking. Had there been such agreement in wording, a conclusion of probability, such as we have alleged for other NT writings, would doubtless have been warranted. As it is, however, the evidence indicates only the possibility of Clement's knowledge of, and dependence upon, the Gospel of John.

2. *The First Epistle*

Because of the agreement both in language and content between the Gospel of John and the First Epistle of John it is often difficult to assign a possible allusion specifically to the First Epistle. Indeed, a few of the possibilities mentioned above may equally well be claimed on behalf of the First Epistle. This factor combined with the brevity of the Epistle suggests that little can be found which might indicate a possible influence upon Clement.

Perhaps the most striking of the possible allusions to 1 John is found in 49.5 where Clement writes: *ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐτελειώθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ*. The words are found again in 50.3, *οἱ ἐν ἀγάπῃ τελειωθέντες*. Clement may have borrowed this expression from 1 Jn. 4.18 *ἀλλ' ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη ἔξω βάλλει τὸν φόβον, ὅτι ὁ φόβος κόλασιν ἔχει, ὁ δὲ φοβούμενος οὐ τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ* (cf. also 1 Jn. 2.5; 4.12). Striking though the similarity is, it must be noted that in Clement's first passage the emphasis is slightly different. There it is not "perfect love" that is in question, as in 1 John, but rather love as an attribute of perfection. Moreover, if Clement is alluding to 1 John, it is peculiar that there are no further specific allusions to the moving words concerning love in 1 Jn. 4.7-21—especially since Clement's passage occurs in the middle of his panegyric on love in which he makes free use of 1 Cor. 13 and probably also alludes to 1 Pet. 4.8. There is of course general agreement in the thought that the love of God is made manifest in Christ (cf. Cl. 49.6 *διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην, ἣν ἔσχευ πρὸς ἡμᾶς* with 1 Jn. 4.16, *τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχει ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν* and 1 Jn. 4.9), but this was certainly a common emphasis in the early

of early Christianity influenced first by Judaism, second by Greek expressions". *AF* I, 43. Cf. the similar viewpoints of Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 77; and W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen, 1934), p. 211. See also Lightfoot's conclusion concerning the improbability of Clement's knowledge of John's Gospel. *Biblical Essays* (London, 1893), p. 96.

Church, and is not significant for the argument. Moreover, the connection between love and perfection is a natural one in the light of such a conclusion as *μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη* in 1 Cor. 13.13 (cf. also Col. 3.14). It remains a valid possibility that Clement is here alluding to 1 John, but it is doubtful whether the evidence warrants a conclusion of probable dependence.

Among further possible allusions the following, although based on even less actual agreement in wording, deserve mention. In two passages Clement speaks of the blood of Christ: in 7.4 *ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ γινώμεν, ὡς ἔστιν τίμιον τῷ θεῷ [καὶ πατρὶ] αὐτοῦ, ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθὲν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ὑπήνεγκεν*,¹ and in 21.6 *οὐδὲ τὸ αἷμα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη*. In 1 Jn. 1.7 the words *καὶ τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας* suggests a closely allied-point, but influence upon Clement is highly improbable, especially since, as we have already seen, Clement's passage shows particular contacts with 1 Pet. 1.18f. Two further parallels to these words of Clement have been suggested by Braun.² In 1 Jn. 2.2 one reads that Christ *ἰλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου*. The last phrase particularly agrees with Clement (except *ὅλος* for *πᾶς*), and the context is very similar. However, apart from this common universalism, there is no evidence of dependence. Braun's suggestion that 1 Jn. 4.14 *ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέσταλκεν τὸν υἱὸν σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου*, is related to Clement's *διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν* is even less convincing since *σωτήρα* is not expressly linked with *αἷμα*.

When in 51.3 Clement writes *καλὸν γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι περὶ τῶν παραπτωμάτων*, he touches upon a theme found also in 1 Jn. 1.9 *ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστός ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας*. But despite the similar idea in these two passages, no significant agreement in wording exists, and accordingly there is only a remote possibility that Clement here alludes to 1 John. Another similarity in thought, but somewhat more conspicuous, is found in Cl. 35.2f: *καὶ ταῦτα ὑπέπιπτεν πάντα ὑπὸ τὴν διάνοιαν ἡμῶν · τίνα οὖν ἄρα ἐστὶν τὰ ἐτοιμαζόμενα τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ; ὁ δημιουργὸς καὶ πατὴρ τῶν αἰώνων ὁ πανάγιος αὐτὸς γινώσκει τὴν ποσότητα καὶ τὴν καλλονὴν αὐτῶν*. It is conceivable that these

¹ For the bracketed words of the text, see above, p. 239, n. 1.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 176.

words are reminiscent of the statement in 1 Jn. 3.2 that *νὺν τέκνα θεοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ οὕτω ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα*. But again we have at most the mere possibility of an allusion.

It must be concluded then that the suggested parallels cannot establish a probability that Clement has made use of 1 John in writing his epistle.¹ And it may also be mentioned here that no evidence can be found which indicates Clement's knowledge of 2 or 3 John.

3. *The Apocalypse*

The evidence of Clement's knowledge of the Apocalypse is equally slight. There is indeed only one passage in Clement which demands attention as a possible indication of influence from the Apocalypse. It consists of a citation which is apparently made up of several different OT passages.

<i>Clement 34.3</i> (Text of A)	<i>Revelation 22.12</i> (Text of Nestle- Aland)	<i>Isaiah 40.10</i> (Text of Rahlfs)	<i>Isaiah 62.11</i>
προλέγει γὰρ ἡμῖν · ἰδοὺ ὁ κύριος,	ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι ταχὺ,	ἰδοὺ κύριος μετὰ ἰσχύος ἔρχεται ...	ἰδοὺ σοι ὁ σωτὴρ παραγίνεται
καὶ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ,	καὶ ὁ μισθὸς μου μετ' ἐμοῦ,	ἰδοὺ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ.	ἔχων τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μισθόν, καὶ τὸ ἔργον πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ.
ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστω κατὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ.	ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστω ὡς τὸ ἔργον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ.	<i>Proverbs 24.12</i> (cf. also Ps. 16.13; Rom. 2.6) ὃς ἀποδίδωσιν ἐκάστω κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.	

The agreement between Clement and the Apocalypse in combining these particular OT passages is too significant to be dismissed as fortuitous, and must accordingly be explained either by direct dependence, or by dependence upon a common source. The actual agreement between Clement and the Apocalypse against the OT texts is slight, being found only in the infinitive *ἀποδοῦναι*, the singular *τὸ ἔργον* and the *καί* preceding *ὁ μισθός*. On the other hand, if Clement is dependent upon the Apocalypse, it is difficult to account for the differences between the

¹ After an examination of some of the parallels, A. E. Brooke rightly concludes that "no weight can be attached to this coincidence of language". *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1912), p. LII.

two, especially Clement's *πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ* for *μετ' ἐμοῦ*, and *ὁ κύριος* for *ἔρχομαι ταχύ*. Further, Clement's words are introduced with the formula *προλέγει γὰρ ἡμῖν*. But since Clement nowhere cites or alludes to NT material under an introductory formula, he is very probably citing either from our canonical OT or from a particular apocalyptic writing which is no longer extant. The fact that the same combination of passages appears in the Apocalypse, together with Clement's use of an introductory formula, suggests that the latter alternative is the more probable. But for two slight variations (the omission of *ὁ* before *κύριος*, and *ἀπὸ* substituted for *πρὸ* before *προσώπου*), Clement's citation is found verbatim in Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* IV, 135, 3). The agreement, however, is explained by dependence upon the Roman Clement since several other OT citations in the immediate context reveal the influence of his Roman namesake. It is possible that the saying in Barn. 21.3, *ἐγγὺς ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ*, is derived from the same apocryphal source upon which Clement and the author of the Apocalypse are dependent, but because of its brevity this remains uncertain. Since Clement elsewhere quotes from apocryphal writings unknown to us,¹ there is no reason to doubt that he may be doing so here. In any event, it is clear that the present passage cannot substantiate a conclusion of probability as to Clement's knowledge of the Apocalypse.²

The parallels reviewed in this chapter have called attention to the similarities both in thought and language between Clement's epistle and 1 Peter and James, perhaps reflecting a common religious milieu for the three epistles. Clement's verbal agreement in the parallels to both 1 Peter and James suggested the probability of literary dependence. Verbal agreement in the parallels between Clement and Acts at several points seemed to make literary dependence probable, although to a lesser degree. For the Johannine literature, including Revelation, although much material common to Clement's epistle was found, the lack of verbal agreement precluded the probability of literary dependence. Only for the Fourth Gospel is the possibility of such dependence worth noticing, although even here dependence seems rather improbable.

¹ See above, p. 86ff.

² N. B. Stonehouse writes that perhaps Clement's epistle "had been dispatched already when word reached Rome of the new prophecy which had been received by the churches of Asia Minor, if it was not actually written before the Apocalypse". *The Apocalypse in the Ancient Church* (Goes. n.d.). p. 7.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CLEMENT, THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS, AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

Our investigation of Clement's acquaintance with the NT writings has led to the conclusion that he made use of the sayings of Jesus as contained in oral tradition—although it is not improbable that he also knew the written Synoptic Gospels—that he knew a majority of the Pauline Epistles, including quite probably the Pastorals, as well as a number of other writings including Acts, Hebrews, 1 Peter, and James, but probably none of those commonly designated Johannine. In marked contrast with his use of the OT, Clement nowhere provides us with a verbatim citation from these writings. Instead, he prefers to paraphrase or, more frequently, simply to allude to them—at times perhaps unconsciously, thereby indicating his thorough familiarity with them.

How does Clement's use of the NT compare with that of the other Apostolic Fathers? What can be said of the manner in which Clement uses these writings, and can any explanation be given for it? In this chapter we propose to summarize the use of the NT in the sub-apostolic decades as illustrated in the Apostolic Fathers—and especially in relationship to Clement's use of the NT—and then to draw together in more connected fashion the explanations of the phenomena observed in the preceding three chapters.

A. THE USE OF INTRODUCTORY FORMULAE

Although most of the Apostolic Fathers employ introductory formulae with OT quotations—not, however, consistently¹—they practically never use such formulae in introducing NT quotations.

Clement's epistle, which, of course, abounds in introductory formulae used with OT quotations, employs formulae with NT material in only two places. In both places it is the words of Jesus which are being introduced and in both the formulae are specialized. In 13.1f. the formu-

¹ For the use of introductory formulae with OT quotations in the Apostolic Fathers, see above, p. 31ff.

la reads *μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, οὓς ἐλάλησεν διδάσκων ἐπιείκειαν καὶ μακροθυμίαν · οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν*. In 46.7f. is the shorter, but comparable, formula *μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ · εἶπεν γάρ*. These formulae immediately bring to mind that of Acts 20.35, *μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν*, which introduces a saying of Jesus not found in the Gospels, and thus presumably one which was handed down orally. This, combined with the form of Clement's citations, has led us to the conclusion that Clement derived these sayings of Jesus not from the Synoptic Gospels, but from oral tradition. The use of a similar formula in Polycarp 2.3, *μνημονεύοντες δὲ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων*, if not derived from Clement's epistle, provides possible confirmation for such a conclusion.

There are in Clement's epistle no further formulae introducing NT quotations or allusions. We may, however, call attention to words which introduce the clear allusion to 1 Corinthians in 47.3ff. Clement writes in 47.1f., *ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου · τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν*; The phrase *ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* is probably an allusion to Phil. 4.15 and is therefore to be understood in a temporal rather than a local sense.¹ It should be added that Clement on several occasions employs introductory formulae with quotations from apocryphal writings² no longer known to us: in 46.2 *γέγραπται γάρ*; in 17.6 *καὶ πάλιν λέγει*; in 23.3f. *ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη, ὅπου λέγει*; cf. also 8.3.

What is true of Clement is very largely true of the other Apostolic Fathers. Ignatius often alludes to NT writings in his epistles, but he never once introduces such an allusion with a formula. This is perhaps not quite so surprising when one realizes that Ignatius is frugal even in his use of introductory formulae with OT quotations.

In Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians, however, we encounter several interesting formulae. In addition to the formula of 2.3, which has just been discussed, Polycarp cites a saying of Jesus under the rubric *καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ κύριος* (7.2). The words which follow are in verbatim agreement with Mk. 14.38 and Mt. 26.41, whether they are derived from either of these Gospels or not. In 12.1 (extant only in Latin translation) Polycarp writes *Modo, ut his scripturis dictum est*, whereupon

¹ For further discussion of the use of the word *εὐαγγέλιον* in the Apostolic Fathers, see below, p. 332.

² For a discussion of these passages, see pp. 86-93.

he proceeds to cite Eph. 4.26. The latter consists of a verbatim citation of the opening words of Ps. 4.5 followed by what are presumably Paul's own words, *ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ παροργισμῶ ὑμῶν*. Polycarp either mistakenly believed that the latter saying was also from an OT passage, or else he intentionally refers to Ephesians under the heading of scripture.¹ Another significant formula is found in 11.2 where Polycarp quotes words from 1 Cor. 6.2, adding *sicut Paulus docet*. We may also note the quasi-formula *εἰδότες ὅτι*, which Polycarp uses in alluding to the Pauline Epistles in 1.3 (Eph. 2.8); 5.1 (Gal. 6.7); 4.1 (1 Tim. 6.7); and to Synoptic material in 6.1 (cf. also the similar formulae in 11.2 and 9.2). In 4.3 the same formula introduces an allusion to Cl. 21.3, which however is immediately followed by an allusion to 1 Cor. 14.25. Polycarp's epistle thus presents us with an array of introductory formulae used with NT quotations and allusions, but it must be noted that none of these formulae are the classic ones generally used by the Apostolic Fathers in citing an authoritative OT scripture (e.g. *γέγραπται*, *λέγει ἡ γραφή*).

It is an interesting fact that in the Didache, words of Jesus are introduced with a formula similar to those used with OT citations. Thus the saying of Jesus in 9.5 is introduced *καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἶρηκεν ὁ κύριος* with which may be compared OT quotations introduced in 14.3 *αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ῥηθεῖσα ὑπὸ κυρίου* and in 16.7 with *ὥς ἐρρέθη*. This possibly indicates that a written Gospel is the source of the saying, and that its authority approximates that of the OT writings.² It should be added however that a non-canonical quotation is similarly introduced in 1.6 with the words *ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τούτου δὲ εἶρηται*. In 8.2 the Lord's prayer is introduced with the words *ὥς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ*. There are no further introductory formulae to be found in the Didache, either in conjunction with OT or NT quotations. Thus of the various NT allusions in the Didache, formulae are

¹ Köster suggests that Polycarp intended the formula to refer only to the opening words, i.e. the OT passage, and then inadvertently added the words from Ephesians which immediately came to mind from the words of Ps. 4.5. *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 113. Thus also W. R. Schoedel, *Polycarp, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Fragments of Papias, AF V* (Camden, N.J., 1967), p. 35. This fails to give an account to the plural *his scripturis*. This point cannot be pressed, however, since the phrase may possibly refer back to the *sacris literis* which is found in the preceding sentence. Thus W. Bauer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, HZNT II, 296.

² J.-P. Audet, however, argues in his monumental commentary that only for chapters 11-16 is it correct to assume the use of a written source. *La Didaché, Études Bibliques* (Paris, 1958), p. 104ff.

found only with reference to the words of Jesus, which are in the one instance (9.5) apparently regarded as equally authoritative with the OT.

There are in the Epistle of Barnabas many OT quotations and allusions which are introduced with introductory formulae, but as in Clement, practically none are employed with NT allusions. In fact, there is only one instance of the use of a formula with NT material, but that, as it happens, is a quite significant one. In 4.14 Barnabas cites a saying of Jesus, in nearly verbatim agreement with Mt. 22.14, introducing it with the formula *ὡς γέγραπται*. There are three possible explanations for this: (1) Barnabas, quoting the saying from memory, mistakenly thought it was found in the OT; (2) the saying was found in an apocryphal writing now unknown (*γέγραπται* is used with Enoch in 4.3; cf. 16.5); or (3) Barnabas intends to quote the Gospel of Matthew as Scripture. Because of the close agreement in wording with Mt. 22.14, the most appealing conclusion is that Barnabas cites Matthew as Scripture, thus putting the words of Jesus on a par with the OT.¹ For some, however, such a conclusion is intolerable, and one of the two alternative explanations is preferred.² Barnabas, however, also employs introductory formulae with the apocryphal book known as 1 Enoch: *γέγραπται* in 4.3, and *λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή* in 16.5; and he can refer to other apocryphal writers as "prophets" (11.9; 12.1). Grant accordingly finds no reason to deny the use of an introductory formula with words derived from Matthew.³ What is perhaps a further apocryphal saying in 6.13, is introduced with the formula *λέγει δὲ κύριος*.

In keeping with its allusive use of both the OT and NT, the Shepherd of Hermas nowhere employs formulae for the introduction of canonical material. In the whole of this long treatise, only once is an introductory formula employed. In this instance, found in *Vis.* II, 3, 4, the source of the quotations is specified, *ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἑλδὰδ καὶ*

¹ H. Windisch compares the citation to 2 Cl. 2.4 and writes "Die *γραφὴ* kann sich nur auf Mt. 22.14 beziehen". *Der Barnabasbrief, Die Apostolischen Väter*, HZNT III (Tübingen, 1920), p. 326. Cf. Zahn, *GNTK* I, 848, n. 1, who is of the same opinion and regards the alternative explanations as "völlig nutzlos".

² Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 126, and the Oxford Committee, *NTAF*, p. 18, prefer an apocryphal source for the saying. Cf. R. A. Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache*, *AF* III, 91.

³ He adds, "To find that the Gospel of Matthew is as 'scriptural' as 1 Enoch does not give Matthew much credit". *The Formation of the NT*, p. 107.

Μωδᾶδ, τοῖς προφητεύουσιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ. Thus here, as in Barnabas, the formula ὡς γέγραπται is applied to an apocryphal writing. Elsewhere allusions are made without the use of formulae.

In the so-called 2 Clement, several OT quotations are introduced with formulae, as are also a few NT and apocryphal quotations. Twice the words of Jesus are introduced with special formulae. In 2.4, following a quotation from Isaiah, the author writes καὶ ἑτέρα δὲ γραφή λέγει, after which follows a citation in exact agreement with Mk. 2.17 (= Mt. 9.13). Similarly in 13.4 the author quotes words of Jesus (? from Lk. 6.32,35) with the formula λέγει ὁ θεός. Sayings for which the source is sometimes doubtful are more than once introduced with the words λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος or some version thereof (see 3.2; 4.2; 6.1; 8.5). Sayings more definitely from a non-canonical gospel are also introduced in 5.2f. with λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος (cf. 4.5 and its formula, εἶπεν ὁ κύριος). The interesting formula λέγει γὰρ καὶ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος introduces in 11.2 a passage from an apocryphal writing which is also found (agreeing almost exactly) in 1 Cl. 23.3, where it is introduced as ἡ γραφή αὕτη, ὅπου λέγει. In 2 Clement, then, introductory formulae are employed not only with OT quotations, but also with apocryphal quotations and NT quotations as well. With regard to the latter, however, the formulae are restricted to sayings of Jesus from the Synoptic Gospels, or Synoptic tradition, and never occur with allusions to other NT writings.

To extend our survey beyond the Apostolic Fathers, a similar situation obtains in the writings of Justin Martyr where introductory formulae are employed with NT quotations only when the words of Jesus are being cited. This is generally true, indeed, of all writers of this period, although special attention should be called to the Alexandrian Gnostic Basilides (writing c. 125) who, if the account given by Hippolytus can be trusted,¹ several times cited Paul's epistles with the formula ὡς γέγραπται (Romans, 2 Corinthians, Ephesians) and once with ἡ γραφή λέγει (1 Corinthians).²

Several things become apparent from this survey of the introductory formulae applied by the Apostolic Fathers to NT allusions and

¹ Grant argues (against Jacquier) that the formulae were from the hand of Basilides and not inserted by Hippolytus. *Ibid.*, p. 122. On the basis of these formulae, Grant concludes it probable "that the idea of treating NT books as 'scripture' arose in Alexandria early in the second century". *Ibid.*, p. 123.

² Hippolytus, *Philosophumena* VII, 25f.

quotations. (1) In contrast to the rather free use of introductory formulae with OT quotations, they are used only rarely with NT quotations. (2) As with OT quotations, no absolute relationship exists between the exactness of quotation and the use or non-use of an introductory formula. Nearly exact quotations appear without such formulae; free, paraphrastic quotations appear with introductory formulae. (3) The use of introductory formulae is by no means restricted to quotations from our canonical writings. This fact indicates either that our authors regarded these various books as in some sense canonical, or that the introductory formula, despite the classic form it often takes, is not to be regarded as a *terminus technicus*. More probably the early Church had a rather expanded OT canon.¹ (4) So far as the NT is concerned, introductory formulae are with very few exceptions limited to words of Jesus. This suggests that the latter were held in special esteem by the early Christians, and that they possessed authority equal to that of the OT Scriptures. Other NT writings, coming from the circle of apostles, as they did, were certainly regarded as authoritative, and yet at the same time it had not become customary to introduce them with proper formulae or to refer to them as *γραφή*.²

Clement's use of introductory formulae with NT material accords well, for the most part, with that of the Apostolic Fathers. There may be in one or two later instances (e.g. 2 Clement) the beginning of explicit references to NT writings as "scripture" by the application of proper introductory formulae, but the nonchalant, incidental character of these formulae indicates no consciousness on the author's part that he is making a radical innovation. It would seem wrong to interpret this slight development in the terminology of the formulae as indicating a drastic change in attitude towards the NT writings. The general failure on the part of the Apostolic Fathers to apply introductory formulae to allusions or quotations from NT writings is probably to be explained on the basis of custom rather than by any specific valuation of those writings.

B. ALLUSION AND QUOTATION

P. N. Harrison has justly pointed out the danger of assessing the

¹ See above, p. 111ff.

² Grant rightly notes that the Apostolic Fathers were on the verge of referring to the NT writings as *γραφή*, but were "either reluctant to do so or not interested in the question". *The Formation of the NT.*, p. 124.

use of the NT in the Apostolic Fathers by an indiscriminate compilation of statistics on the basis of tables occasionally provided in the printed editions.¹ For example, one allusion cannot add to the probability that Clement alluded to two different NT books! Furthermore, where the use of the NT is for the most part allusory, a numerical tabulation of resemblances can be misleading. Accordingly, the comparisons made below focus not on statistics, but rather on basic similarities in the attempt to establish the general pattern of NT usage in the Apostolic Fathers.²

1. *The Synoptic Gospels*

Although it is frequently argued that Clement's citation of Jesus' words in 13.2 and 46.8 are dependent upon Matthew and Luke, we have suggested that they are more probably derived from oral tradition. Beyond these citations, contact with the Synoptic tradition is to be seen only in Clement's allusion to the parable of the sower (24.5) and in the form of an OT citation (15.2), but in neither case can it be conclusively determined which of the Synoptics Clement is dependent upon. Thus the free manner in which Clement uses Synoptic material affords little help in determining which of the Synoptic Gospels he may have known.

This free use of Synoptic material is found also in the other Apostolic Fathers. Ignatius, in his several allusions to sayings of Jesus, appears to be primarily dependent upon Matthew (cf. *Smyrn.* 1.1 with Mt. 3.15; *Polycarp* 2.2 with Mt. 10.16),³ but indicates a probable knowledge of Luke as well (cf. *Polycarp* 2.1 with Lk. 6.32). In some instances it cannot be determined which of these two Synoptics lies behind an

¹ *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*, p. 231ff. Harrison took special exception to a statement by C. Bigg (who relied on the tables in Lightfoot's edition) that the books of our NT canon are substantially present in Clement's epistle. Our detailed examination of the resemblances, however, has shown that Bigg's conclusion was not far from the mark.

² Detailed examinations of the NT in the Apostolic Fathers are not lacking. For the Gospels, see W. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876); H. Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 (Berlin, 1957); E. Massaux, *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée* (Louvain, 1950). For the Pauline Epistles see Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago, 1941); for the remainder of the NT, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, by a committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology (Oxford, 1905).

³ See further, *NTAF*, p. 76ff.

allusion (e.g. *Eph.* 14.2). Nowhere, however, does Ignatius provide us with an exact citation from the Synoptic Gospels, and accordingly it has been denied that he made use of them at all.¹ Most of the allusions, however, cannot be satisfactorily explained as being dependent upon oral tradition. Moreover, there also seem to be a few possible allusions to narrative sections of the Synoptics (*Eph.* 17.1; *Smyrn.* 1.2). In at least one passage Ignatius may have quoted from an apocryphal gospel (*Smyrn.* 3.2), but the words may equally well be a paraphrase of Lk. 24.39.² The most satisfactory explanation of the Synoptic material in these epistles is that Ignatius is dependent upon his memory of the written Synoptics. An added point in favour of this explanation is that it accords fully with the way in which Ignatius uses the OT, for in contrast to Clement he nowhere gives an exact citation from the OT Scriptures. Indeed, we should expect to encounter quotation from memory in epistles written by a man travelling to Rome as a prisoner under Roman guard.

Synoptic allusions in Polycarp's epistle are few and confined entirely to words of Jesus. The interesting citation in 2.3, which has already been discussed,³ resembles the citation in Cl. 13.2, but because of the form in which it is given, as well as the introductory formula, it is probable that the words are derived from oral tradition. Elsewhere, however, Polycarp indicates his awareness of the Synoptic tradition, probably in written form. In 7.2 he appears to cite Mt. 26.41 (= Mk. 14.38), the concluding words *τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής* being in verbatim agreement with both Matthew and Mark. Despite the fact that the words preceding this saying are also attributed to Jesus in the Synoptics, Polycarp inserts the introductory formula *καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ κύριος* which suggests the possibility of an independent source for the saying, perhaps in oral tradition.⁴ On the other hand, the insertion may be of no special significance whatever. Synoptic tradition is also reflected in 6.1f., but it cannot be determined whether Matthew or Luke underlies the allusion.⁵ Polycarp, then, appears

¹ H. Köster with great difficulty manages to deny that Ignatius knew Matthew. *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 60f. Grant has rightly criticized Köster's explanation of Synoptic material in the epistles of Ignatius. See *AF* I, 60f.

² Cf. *NTAF*, p. 80; Grant, *AF* I, 63.

³ See above, p. 141ff.

⁴ Cf. *NTAF*, p. 103.

⁵ Grant mistakenly says that 6.2 is an exact quotation of Mt. 13.14-15. *The Formation of the NT*, p. 104. The closest Matthean parallel is 6.12, and is by no means exact.

to know sayings of Jesus from oral tradition, but also one or more of the Synoptic Gospels, which he quotes loosely and from memory.¹ Exact quotation from the Gospels is not found, except possibly in 7.2, and it is only the words of Jesus to which Polycarp alludes.

There is, of course, a wealth of Synoptic material to be found in the Didache. The compendium of Jesus' teachings used in delineating the Way of Life in chapter one is derived primarily from the Sermon on the Mount. Even if Did. 1.3b-2.1 is an interpolation, it is, as Grant says, "probably an early one".² The words of Jesus which are cited here may be dependent upon the written Matthew and/or Luke, in which case they are quoted from memory, or they may derive from oral tradition, or perhaps even from a written λόγοι source.³ The source for other Synoptic material in the Didache remains equally problematic. Much of it can be accounted for on the basis of liturgical tradition, e.g. the baptismal formula of 7.1, the Lord's prayer of 8.2 and the eucharist allusion in 9.2. Some can be accounted for as directly dependent upon the OT, e.g. 1.2; 3.7. It seems clear enough, however, that the Gospel of Matthew is used in the Didache, not only from the allusions of chapter one, but also the sayings recorded in 11.7 (Mt. 12.31) and 13.1 (Mt. 10.10), the verbatim saying of 9.5, introduced by εἶρηκεν ὁ κύριος (Mt. 7.6), as well as the apocalyptic chapter (16) which is based on Mt. 24.⁴ In the Didache it is again the words of Jesus that are alluded to, and again the allusion tends to be free, often creating an enigma as to the exact source of the material.

¹ Köster surprisingly allows that Polycarp's epistle evidences a knowledge of both Matthew and Luke. *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 121f. One suspects that such a conclusion is allowed here, although denied in the case of Ignatius—where the evidence is equally compelling—because Köster, following Harrison, can date the first twelve chapters of Polycarp's epistle towards the middle of the second century.

² *The Formation of the NT*, p. 64.

³ A fourth possibility mentioned by the Oxford Committee, the use of an early gospel harmony, is a less probable explanation. *NTAF*, p. 35.

⁴ R. Glover, however, has argued that the Didachist did not know Matthew (or Luke), but instead derived his sayings of Jesus from the sources which Matthew and Luke themselves used. "The Didache's Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels", *NTS* 5 (1958-59), 12-29. Glover's arguments, though interesting, are subtle and ultimately rest upon too many contingencies. For a similar view of the Didache's quotations, see Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 240. Kraft, following Köster writes, "Probably the Didache is not directly dependent on the written Gospels as we know them, but either uses a 'harmony' tradition which developed from them or, more likely, used the kind of material which they fixed in writing but which continued to circulate (in various forms) after they were written". *Op. cit.*, p. 139.

The Epistle of Barnabas, which abounds in OT citations, contains few allusions to the Synoptic tradition.¹ It is significant, however, that several of these may refer to the passion narrative of the Synoptics. Thus in 6.6, 7.3, and 7.9 allusion is made to OT anticipations of details of the crucifixion of Jesus which are recorded in the Synoptic tradition (cf. respectively Mt. 27.35 and parallels [also Jn. 19.24]; Mt. 27.34; and Mt. 27.28 and parallel). Allusions to words of Jesus are probably to be seen in 5.9 (Mt. 9.13 and parallels), and possibly in the use of an OT allusion in 5.12 (Mt. 26.31 and parallel; Zc. 13.7), and citation in 12.10 (Mt. 22.41ff. and parallels; Ps. 109.1). Most striking, however, is the citation of Jesus' words in 4.14 where the words πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί are cited under the rubric ὡς γέγραπται. Except for the omission of γάρ εἰσιν after πολλοί, the words agree exactly with Mt. 22.14 (and Mt. 20.16, where in some later MSS the words have been added). Whatever the import of the introductory formula may be,² it appears that, of the Synoptics, Barnabas knew at least Matthew.³ Again it is the freedom of allusion that characterizes Barnabas' use of Synoptic material. His anomalous allusion to narrative material and the paucity of allusion to the words of Jesus are the result of the underlying purposes of the epistle.

In the Shepherd of Hermas, allusions to the Synoptics are confined to the words of Jesus. Usually it is difficult to trace the allusions to one particular Gospel, as in *Sim.* IX, 20, 2 and 29, 1ff. (cf. respectively Mt. 19.23 and parallels; Mt. 18.3 and parallels). Hermas seems to make use of a few parables of Jesus in the third section of his treatise, "Similitudes". Thus in *Sim.* IX, 20, 1 (cf. *Vis.* III, 6, 5) we find allusion to the parable of the sower, in *Sim.* V, 2, allusion to various of Jesus' parables, and in *Sim.* III, 3; IV, 2; and V, 5, 2 allusions to the parable of the tares. The latter allusions are very probably derived from Matthew 13. In *Mand.* IV, 1, 1, and IV, 1, 6, Hermas indicates a probable knowledge of Matthew (cf. Mt. 5.28 and 19.9), although in

¹ Despite the fact that Barnabas 18-21 is dependent upon Did. 1-6 or, with the Didache, dependent upon a common source (thus Kraft, convincingly; *op. cit.*, p. 4f.), Barnabas lacks the Synoptic material found in Did. 1. This favours the hypothesis that the sayings of Jesus are an interpolation in Did. 1.

² See below, p. 341.

³ Köster argues that the apparent contacts with the Synoptic Gospels are to be explained as the result of the common tradition (primarily Jewish) underlying both Barnabas and the Synoptics. Despite 4.14, it is claimed that Barnabas did not know Matthew. *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 156ff.

the second instance Matthew's *μὴ ἐπὶ προνοίᾳ* is omitted, making dependence on Mk. 10.11 a possibility. Lk. 18.1 is possibly reflected in *Mand.* IX, 8. Finally we may note the saying of Jesus found in *Vis.* IV, 2, 6, which also occurs in Cl. 46.8, but in a rather different form. It seems clear, then, that Hermas probably knew at least Matthew, but possibly also Mark and Luke.¹ The words of Jesus are alluded to freely and the source often remains ambiguous.

The epistle which is erroneously called 2 Clement contains many allusions to the Synoptic tradition, all of which are to words of Jesus. These allusions tend to be so paraphrastic that it is often difficult to determine their source, especially since the author also made use of non-canonical sayings of Jesus (cf. 12.2; 5.2ff.). The written or oral source from which these non-canonical sayings derive may perhaps account for some sayings which have *prima facie* parallels in the canonical Gospels (e.g. 8.5; 2.5,7; 6.1f; 13.4). It seems equally probable, however, that the source for the latter lies in the written Synoptics which the author may well be quoting from memory. In contrast to the normal freedom of allusion is the formal citation in 2.4 *καὶ ἑτέρα δὲ γραφή λέγει, ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς* which agrees verbatim with Mk. 2.17 (= Mt. 9.13, the latter differing only in having *οὐ γάρ* for *οὐκ*). The influence of Mark is perhaps also to be seen in the allusion to Dt. 6 in 3.4 (cf. Mk. 12.30). It is thus probable that the author of 2 Clement knew some, if not all, of the written Synoptics.² At the same time, however, his allusions to the words of Jesus are for the most part very free.

A pattern can thus be seen in the use of the Synoptic Gospels by the Apostolic Fathers. They are interested almost exclusively in the words of Jesus—words which they regarded as authoritative, on a par with the OT Scriptures. Yet despite the fact that in all probability they knew our written Gospels, on only one or two occasions is there any-

¹ Köster, however, again explains the contacts as due to a common underlying tradition and denies that Hermas used any of the Synoptics. *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 254ff. C. Taylor has argued that Hermas refers to the Gospels, as Irenaeus did after him, as necessarily four in number. The argument, however, is rather subtle, depending on a number-symbolism which is by no means explicit. *The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels* (London, 1892). Taylor has, however, convincingly shown contacts between Hermas and the Synoptics.

² In the light of the non-canonical material in 2 Clement, Köster's suggestion that the author used a written collection of sayings of Jesus—similar to that of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri—is attractive, but remains beyond proof. *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 110f.

thing like an exact quotation. This phenomenon is seen again in Justin Martyr who, although he was certainly acquainted with the Synoptic Gospels, quotes them quite freely, probably from memory,¹ but in a way that at least raises the possibility of the use of a non-canonical source.² The same free quotation of Synoptic material can be seen somewhat later in Athenagoras and Theophilus.³ It is this freedom in the quotation of the words of Jesus which, when combined with the known circulation of both oral tradition and non-canonical writings, makes the exact determination of source such a difficult task.

2. *The Pauline Epistles*

As we have seen, Clement alludes to a majority of the epistles which make up the Pauline corpus. The clearest and least disputable allusions are those from 1 Corinthians and Romans, although Clement probably refers as well to Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 1 Timothy and Titus. Yet despite Clement's familiarity with and respect for Paul's epistles, nowhere does he give an exact citation from them. This is true, as well, for the Apostolic Fathers in general.

Ignatius, like Clement, seems to know the majority of Paul's epistles and, as in Clement, it is 1 Corinthians and Romans that are most clearly alluded to.⁴ There is also considerable evidence for the use of Ephesians and Colossians and indications of a probable knowledge of 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, and the Pastorals. However, even in the clearest allusions (cf. Ign. *Eph.* 18.1 with 1 Cor. 1.18,20; Ign. *Rom.* 5.1 with 1 Cor. 4.4) we do not have quotation.⁵ The most natural ex-

¹ Thus Zahn, *GNTK* I, p. 481ff. Cf. Massaux, *op. cit.*, p. 503ff.

² Cf. A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Leiden, 1967). Bellinzoni explains Justin's quotations by asserting his dependence on a primitive harmony of the Synoptic Gospels. Two weaknesses in Bellinzoni's argument stand out. (1) Like Resch he assumes that certain similarities and combinations found in more than one writer necessarily witness to a common, written source for the quotations. (2) Building on the similarities, he fails to account for the differences in the same quotations. Moreover, despite his claims (p. 47, 139), he has nowhere proved that the form of Justin's quotations cannot be the result of quotation from memory. Cf. also W. Bousset, *Die Evangelienzitate Justins des Märtyrers in ihren Wert für die Evangelienkritik* (Göttingen, 1891).

³ See the table in Grant, *The Formation of the NT*, p. 146f.

⁴ See H. Rathke's study, *Ignatius von Antiochen und die Paulusbriefe*, TU 99 (Berlin, 1967).

⁵ Cf. *NTAF*, p. 67.

planation of this free allusion is that Ignatius, travelling as a prisoner under Roman guard, is quoting from memory.¹

Polycarp also alludes to most of Paul's epistles. Again it is 1 Corinthians that is best attested, but there is also convincing evidence that Polycarp knew Romans, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians, and quite probably the Thessalonian epistles and Pastorals, as well. Most of the allusions are free, although in a few instances they are fairly close to the Pauline text (cf. *Phil.* 5.3 with 1 Cor. 6.9; *Phil.* 1.3 with Eph. 2.8). In two places, surviving only in Latin translation, we have nearly verbatim quotations:² in 11.2 words from 1 Cor. 6.2 are quoted, followed by the words *sicut Paulus docet*; and in 12.1, Eph. 4.26 is apparently quoted under the heading of Scripture. There is, however, no exact citation, but for the most part only free allusion, suggesting that Polycarp was content to quote Paul from memory.

In the remaining Apostolic Fathers, the Pauline epistles are not alluded to so frequently as in Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp. This has led Barnett to the conclusion that the Pauline epistles declined in their popularity during the first half of the second century "apparently due to the espousal of Paul by heretical groups as the truest exponent of Christianity".³ Barnett's argument, however, is made to stand on some rather precarious datings (e.g. of James, Jude, Didache), and ignores the peculiar character of some of these writings (e.g. Barnabas, Hermas), which in itself explains the paucity of allusions to the epistles of Paul. Moreover, Barnett has let his theory control his reading of the evidence, for these writings are not entirely without allusions to the Pauline epistles.

The Didache possibly alludes to 1 Corinthians, Romans, and 1 Thessalonians. If the "Two Ways" section (chapters 1-6) was originally a Jewish document, except for the Christian interpolation of 1.3b-2.1, it is not surprising that these chapters contain no clear allusion to Paul's epistles. Since the remainder of the work is largely concerned with liturgical matters, possible allusions to the Pauline epistles may often be explained equally well on the basis of liturgical tradition (e.g. Did. 9.2 and 1 Cor. 10.16,21; Did. 10.6 and 1 Cor. 16.22). Similarly, instruction in conduct can possibly trace back to common features

¹ Cf. Barnett, *op. cit.*, p. 152f.

² It is not impossible, however, that the Latin translator has harmonized these quotations with the text of the Pauline Epistles.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 186.

in oral catechesis (e.g. Did. 12.3 and 2 Thes. 3.10). The Didache is a product of Jewish Christianity and it may well be for this reason, rather than a supposed decline in the popularity of Paul's epistles, that Paul's influence upon this treatise is negligible.

The Epistle of Barnabas was written to show how the OT, when correctly (i.e. allegorically) interpreted, can be seen to foreshadow Christianity in which it finds its true fulfilment. A specialized purpose such as this does not lead one to expect an abundance of allusions to the Pauline epistles. There are, nonetheless, in Barnabas clear allusions to Romans and Ephesians, and possible allusions to 1 and 2 Corinthians, Colossians, and the Pastoral Epistles.¹ However, even the clearest allusions are quite free (Barn. 13.7 and Rom. 4.3,10f; Barn. 6.11ff. and Eph. 2.10; 4.22ff.); nowhere do we find verbal exactness in these allusions. Since Barnabas is equally free in his use of OT quotations (cf. Barn. 6.8 and Ex. 33.1ff.), probably as a result of relying upon his memory,² it is safe to conclude that the allusions to the Pauline epistles are likewise based upon memory.

The Shepherd of Hermas again belongs to a very specialized type of literature—the record of direct revelation in the form of visions. There is thus an *a priori* improbability that Paul's epistles (or any other writings) will be alluded to with any frequency. In fact, there are in this very long document no quotations at all from the OT. Possible allusions to the NT as a whole are few. From this it can be seen how unsatisfactory it is to cite Hermas in support of a supposed decline in the popularity of Paul's epistles. Hermas does, however, seem clearly to allude to 1 Corinthians (cf. *Mand.* IV, 6, 1f. with 1 Cor. 7.39f.) and Ephesians (cf. *Mand.* X, 2, 1ff. with Eph. 4.30; *Sim.* IX, 13, 5 with Eph. 4.3ff.), and also quite possibly to Romans, 2 Corinthians, Philippians, Colossians, and 1 Thessalonians. The allusions are quite free, often amounting to the appropriation of some idea or phraseology recalled from the Pauline epistles by memory.

The homily known as 2 Clement might well have been expected to make greater use of the Pauline epistles than it does. On the one hand, this homily is not so purely Jewish in character as are the Didache and the Shepherd of Hermas, and on the other hand, much of its subject matter is also discussed by Paul in his epistles. Nevertheless, there

¹ There is thus no justification for claiming with Barnett that Barnabas witnesses to the subsidence of the popularity of the Pauline letters.

² *NTAF*, p. 1.

are comparatively few allusions to Paul's epistles. The clearest are those to 1 Corinthians and Ephesians, but there are also possible allusions to Romans and Galatians. Thus there can be little question as to the author's knowledge of the Pauline corpus;¹ it is only that he does not allude as often or as clearly to these epistles as do other of the Apostolic Fathers. The allusions in 2 Clement are again characterized by their freedom. As in his OT citations, the writer seems to rely upon his memory, and shows no concern for verbal exactness.

The author of the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* apparently knew the Pauline corpus, for he probably alludes to 1 Corinthians and Philippians and quite possibly Romans, 2 Corinthians, and 1 Thessalonians. Again the allusions are made with great freedom.

Like Clement of Rome, all the Apostolic Fathers use the Pauline epistles with great freedom. Allusion is the rule; exact quotation is completely lacking. This phenomenon continues into the last half of the second century, and can be seen in the writings of Justin Martyr, Tatian, Melito, and Athenagoras.² Since in tracing allusions to the Pauline epistles we have no problems of source-criticism and no question of oral tradition (except perhaps for the paraenetic sections) such as confronted us in the allusions to the Synoptic Gospels, the only plausible explanation of the majority of these free allusions is that they are due to quotation from memory.

3. *Remaining Writings*

There is no need, for our purposes, to trace the use of the rest of the NT writings in the Apostolic Fathers in any detail, for the pattern is quite the same as for the Pauline epistles. That is, again we meet with free allusion, and again exact quotation is nowhere found.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, so prominent in Clement, seems alluded to in the other Apostolic Fathers with the exception of the *Didache*. There are apparent allusions to 1 Peter in the Apostolic Fathers, again with the exception of the *Didache*. Especially noteworthy are the allusions in Polycarp³ which though striking (cf. 1.3 with 1 Pet. 1.8; 10.2 with 1 Pet. 2.12; etc.), are never exact, but are instead paraphrastic. Witness to the Epistle of James in the Apostolic Fathers is

¹ Grant concludes that a "common 'library'" underlies 1 and 2 Clement. *The Formation of the NT*, p. 89.

² See Barnett, *op. cit.*, pp. 228-251.

³ Eusebius called attention to Polycarp's use of 1 Peter. *HE* IV, 14, 9.

comparatively weak. Beyond the allusions in Clement, which are doubted by some, the only probable allusions are found in Hermas and (somewhat less likely) in 2 Clement. The Acts of the Apostles, in addition to being (probably) alluded to by Clement, finds probable allusion in Polycarp, and possible allusions in Ignatius and Hermas. For the Johannine literature, which Clement nowhere convincingly alludes to, the witness of the Apostolic Fathers is slight. The Gospel is most clearly alluded to by Ignatius (e.g. *Rom.* 7.2; *Phila.* 7.1), probably by Polycarp, and possibly by Hermas. Polycarp alone provides a possible allusion to 1 John, and nowhere in the Apostolic Fathers is there found a convincing allusion to the Apocalypse.

This cursory survey of the use of the NT in the Apostolic Fathers shows how much at one with them Clement is in the matter. Not only is there similarity in the actual manner of usage but also in the pattern of particular books alluded to. Clement is perhaps somewhat peculiar in his apparent use of Synoptic material via oral tradition, although Polycarp gives probable evidence for the same, and it is not impossible that oral tradition has influenced the form of sayings of Jesus found in the other Apostolic Fathers. Clement also stands apart in his clear and frequent use of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Beyond this, the use made of the Pauline epistles and the other writings is very much the same. Most significant of all is the fact that in Clement and in all the Apostolic Fathers the NT writings are always alluded to, and never cited exactly.

C. EXPLANATIONS OF THE FREE CHARACTER OF ALLUSIONS AND QUOTATIONS

The foregoing discussion has again called attention to the difficulty of source determination which often results from the free manner in which the Apostolic Fathers allude to the NT writings. Suggested explanations have been given in the course of our discussion of Clement's use of the NT, but we are now in a position to assess the various possibilities more fully as well as within the larger perspective of the Apostolic Fathers collectively.

The problem of source is, of course, most troublesome in allusions to the sayings of Jesus and it is made more difficult by the fact that our Synoptic tradition is threefold. Occasionally the source of apparent allusion to the epistles is also in doubt, especially where paraenetic

material is concerned. Where source is *not* questioned, however, explanation of the free character of an allusion to an epistle is considerably easier. Here (in contrast to the majority of Synoptic allusions) since the source is agreed upon, the free text of the allusion must be due to one of three things : (1) a text of the epistle which differs from that known to us ; (2) purposeful alteration ; or (3) quotation from memory. Since the text of the free allusions in the Apostolic Fathers differs from the original almost always without rhyme or reason, we may largely discount the possibility of purposeful alteration (i.e. as distinguished from an intentionally free rendering). We are left with the possibilities of a differing text and quotation from memory, which we shall now consider briefly before turning to the explanations which capitalize on the doubtfulness of source.

1. *Differing Canonical Text*

Of course, it cannot be seriously maintained that a differing text can account for the form of the allusions to NT writings found in the Apostolic Fathers. From their use of the OT alone it can readily be seen that they were often content with inexact quotation even when employing introductory formulae which themselves might seem to imply exactness. It is, however, worth asking whether *some* of the differences in the quotations and allusions found in the Apostolic Fathers can be accounted for on the basis of a differing NT text. Or to invert the question, Can we find anything in these allusions and quotations that will be of value to the textual criticism of the NT? The importance of any such evidence that might be gleaned from the Apostolic Fathers is obvious. The text of NT writings known to them predates by a century most of the early papyrus MSS thus far discovered, and by two centuries the major uncial MSS of the NT.

However, it is an unfortunate fact that the very manner of allusion and quotation in the Apostolic Fathers makes it unlikely that they can be used with any certainty as witnesses to the text of the NT.¹ Their complete freedom and lack of concern for exactness makes a precise reconstruction of the original text such as is needed for textual criticism difficult, not to say impossible. This is, of course, especially

¹ "Until about AD 150 the quotations are of little value for textual purposes". V. Taylor, *The Text of the NT* (London, 1961), p. 40. Cf. A. Souter, *The Text and Canon of the NT* (London, 1913), p. 76. C. R. Gregory, *Canon and Text of the NT* (Edinburgh, 1907), p. 425.

the case regarding sayings of Jesus where the source itself usually stands in question, but it is also true of the allusions to other parts of the NT as well. And it is ironic that in those very few places where we do encounter nearly exact quotations we must be the more careful to allow for the further possibility of later scribal harmonizations in our MSS of the Fathers.

An examination of Clement's allusions to the NT yields nothing of consequence to the textual criticism of the NT. G. Zuntz, regarding Clement as a witness to the pre-corpus text of the Pauline epistles, has indeed made some ingenious suggestions concerning Clement's allusions, but, with one exception, they remain possibilities at best.¹ Zuntz finds even less evidence in the other Apostolic Fathers (and surprisingly little even in Justin Martyr) that throws light on the early text of the NT. Not until Marcion and Clement of Alexandria does Zuntz find substantial material with which to work. This in fact is what one is led to expect from a survey of early quotation of the NT. Even R. P. Boismard, who zealously upholds the value of patristic citations for textual criticism, is willing to set aside the early writers because of the freedom with which they allude to the NT.² Unfortunately, then, the Apostolic Fathers are virtually of no value in determining the text of the NT at the beginning of the second century. Profitable work in determining pre-Byzantine text-forms will be the result of working with later writers such as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius.³

If we cannot safely deduce the NT text lying behind the free allusions of the Apostolic Fathers, neither can we account for the form of the allusions on the basis of a differing NT text. Accordingly, the only possible explanation of allusions for which the source cannot be in question is that they are the result of quotation from memory.

¹ *The Text of the Epistles*, pp. 217-220. The one exception is Clement's omission of the definite article before ἀγγελων in his allusion to Heb. 1.4 (Cl. 36.2). For a discussion of Zuntz's other suggestions, see above, p. 180, n. 1; 183ff.

² "Si l'on met à part les auteurs primitifs tels que Clément de Rome, Ignace d'Antioche, Justin et même Clément d'Alexandrie, qui procèdent plutôt par allusions que par citations, les Pères citaient le text sacré beaucoup plus fidèlement qu'on ne le pense d'ordinaire". "Critique Textuelle et Citations Patristiques", *RB* 57 (1950), 388.

³ For an excellent and helpful study, see M. J. Suggs, "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text", *NTS* 4 (1957-58), 139-147.

2. *Memory*

There can be no doubt that if the Apostolic Fathers were frequently content with *memoriter* citation of the OT they would with equal readiness have employed the same method in their use of the NT writings.

We have already discussed the practice of quoting from memory in the first century, and need not reproduce that discussion here.¹ Suffice it to say that what is true of the use of memory in citing the OT is true *a fortiori* with regard to the use of NT writings. On the one hand, the same obstacles to exact citation existed. Probably there was greater difficulty of access, due to the few copies of the various MSS which were available. Even when MSS were available for reference, like the OT MSS, they contained a text that was without divisions,² thus making the location of particular passages a difficult and wearisome task.³ On the other hand, there was the same lack of concern for exactness in citation. As in the free use of the OT, what was regarded as important was the message itself, and not the precise form of the words used to convey that message. Indeed, for the more literary-minded person exact citation was not only unnecessary, but in poor taste, and thus a deliberate freedom with one's sources, of the sort that is often entailed in memory quotation, was often favoured.⁴

There are, in addition, three factors which bear an important, though by no means consistent, relationship to the accuracy of quotation, and hence to the use or non-use of memory. First, as we have seen clearly illustrated in Clement's use of the OT, there is often a relation-

¹ See above, p. 103ff.

² Cf. V. H. Stanton's note on "The Form of Ancient Books as Affecting Habits of Quotation", in his *The Gospel as Historical Documents*, I, 22-25.

³ This difficulty may well have been aggravated if the MSS were papyrus rolls. There is evidence, however, that the codex was already used in the first century by the Christian Church. C. H. Roberts argues that Christian writings were put in codex form before the end of the first century and that this "determined the format of the Old Testament books used in the Church rather than vice versa". "Books in the Graeco-Roman World and in the New Testament", *CHB* I, 59f. Cf. C. C. McCown, "Codex and Roll in the NT", *HTR* 34 (1941), 219-250; and C. H. Roberts, "The Christian Book and the Greek Papyri", *JTS* 50 (1949), 155-168. See also below, p. 313, n. 2.

⁴ Westcott writes of Clement's epistle: "Exactness of quotation was foreign to the spirit of the writing". *History of the Canon*, p. 52. Cf. also T. W. Manson on freedom of rendering OT passages, in "The Argument from Prophecy", *JTS* 46 (1945), 136. More generally, see K. Ziegler, "Plagiat", Pauly-Wissowa, *Real Encyclopädie Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (1941), col. 1962ff.

ship between the length of a passage and its accuracy. Longer passages are usually quoted more accurately, in all probability because the MSS were consulted. This was considered worthwhile perhaps not so much for exactness of wording but to insure that no pertinent material in the passage would inadvertently be omitted. Secondly, it is often the case that quotations are more exact when they occur together with introductory formulae. This point cannot be pressed, however, since there are places where formulae introduce rather free quotations. Thirdly, there is a relationship between the accuracy with which a passage is quoted and the purpose for which it is quoted. This in turn depends upon the purpose of the work as a whole. Thus in a work which is primarily apologetic or polemic in nature the quotations may be expected to be more exact than in one which is paraenetic or homiletic in nature.¹

When we look at the use of the NT in the Apostolic Fathers, the following phenomena are observable : (1) NT allusions are almost always brief, (2) introductory formulae are rare, and limited to sayings of Jesus, and (3) the writings are almost exclusively pastoral and paraenetic in character, as is the use made of NT allusions. These facts, combined with the *a priori* arguments against exact citation, point to a situation in which *memoriter* citation would have been considered perfectly adequate, and perhaps even favoured. The circumstances, the manner in which the NT is alluded to, and the general purpose of the allusions all suggest this conclusion.

The particular character of Clement's allusions to the epistles of the NT can satisfactorily be explained on the basis of quotation from memory. A few of the more exact quotations may possibly suggest that Clement referred to the MSS, perhaps abridging material and making stylistic and other changes (e.g. Heb. 1.3f. in Cl. 36.2; 1 Cor. 13 in Cl. 49.5; Rom. 1.29ff. in Cl. 35.5f.). It is interesting in this connection that these are the more lengthy NT allusions in Clement's epistle. Alternatively, however, these may have been passages which Clement had been particularly successful in committing to memory, or which he had been reading just prior to writing his epistle. Elsewhere the literal agreement between Clement's allusions and the NT text is even less, and there is little question but that we must attribute this freedom in the majority of cases to quotation by memory.² This same conclusion holds for the other Apostolic Fathers as well.

¹ Cf. K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew* (Uppsala, 1954), p. 17.

² It does not seem possible to apply Rabbinic standards of accuracy in memorization

Here, then, in the use of the epistles of the NT, we can usually be confident that *memoriter* citation accounts for the form of the allusions. It is true that in some instances we must allow possible dependence upon common, catechetical, homiletic or paraenetic tradition. But for the more obvious allusions, even though they are very free in comparison with the text of the epistles, there is no question of source. In other instances of apparently free allusion, the question of source can and must be raised. Thus for apparently free OT quotations, various possibilities in addition to memory quotation must be examined, such as derivation from non-septuagintal Greek translations, targums, testimony books and non-canonical writings. For quotation of Synoptic material—almost exclusively sayings of Jesus, as we have seen—the possibility of some kind of a written λόγοι source or non-canonical gospel must be considered, as well as the further (and less tangible) possibility of oral tradition. What must be emphasized, however, is that if Clement and the Apostolic Fathers can on occasion quote freely from memory in their use of the epistles, as in their use of the OT, there is no reason why they cannot have done the same with regard to the Synoptic Gospels.

It is just here, of course, that the strength of Lightfoot's argument concerning the Synoptic material lies. Lightfoot prefers to explain the sayings of Jesus in Cl. 13.2 and 46.8 on the basis of quotation of our Synoptic Gospels. Speaking of 13.2 he writes "As Clement's quotations are often very loose, we need not go beyond the Canonical Gospels for the source of the passage". Lightfoot refers to the free manner in which Clement quotes from Joshua 2 in his account of Rahab and the spies (chapter 12).¹ If Clement can do that in the one instance, then other hypotheses are "not needed" to account for the form of the sayings in 13.2. We must, with Lightfoot, allow that free quotation from memory

to the Apostolic Fathers. Thus the accuracy of memory in the transmission of the gospel tradition argued by Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, and the accuracy of memory in Paul's citations argued by Bonsirven, *Exégèse Rabbinique et Exégèse Paulinienne* (Paris, 1939), p. 337, cannot be carried over into the sub-apostolic Church.

¹ I, 2, 52; cf. I, 2, 141. Sanday challenged the appropriateness of this comparison arguing that the Rahab passage was essentially narrative and not discourse. *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 64. Lightfoot's choice of the Rahab passage for his illustration was not a good one since Clement may here be dependent upon a Jewish homiletical tradition and not the canonical Joshua. His point is not thereby lost, however, since he could have brought forward several other passages which are freely cited (and passages which are not narrative, in answer to Sanday).

is at least a legitimate possible explanation of the form of the sayings of Jesus found in the Apostolic Fathers and in later writers as well. Doubtless the explanation of the form, and occasionally even the content of the sayings,¹ on the basis of memory quotation has been often abused, and at times evasive. There is, however, an alternate danger of ignoring or too easily discounting the possible role of memory in quoting the Synoptic Gospels.

Any attempt to account for the phenomena under a single hypothesis presupposes a uniformity which may not exist, and thus risks oversimplification. In all of this we face what is now a familiar dilemma. We can neither dismiss the possibility of memory quotation nor the possibility of the use of a divergent source. In the present instance, each quoted saying of Jesus must be examined individually, especially since it is not improbable that the early Fathers occasionally used more than one of the accessible sources. The admission of quotation of the Synoptic Gospels by memory makes it much more difficult, of course, to identify non-canonical sources with any large degree of certainty. This is especially true since these non-canonical sources, except for the odd fragment, are no longer extant.

In addition, then, to the possibilities of differing canonical text and quotation by memory, with sayings of Jesus as with certain paraenetic passages of the epistolary tradition, further possibilities arise owing to the multiplicity of sources available. These may conveniently be divided into two categories: those which are written, and those which are oral.

3. *Extra-canonical Written Sources*

Under this category several possibilities must be considered. First, a source limited to sayings of Jesus—a written λόγοι source which itself may be (1) a source used by the Synoptics, (2) a source completely independent of the Synoptics, and thus either pre- or post-Synoptic, or (3) a source dependent upon the Synoptics. Secondly, an apocryphal gospel of the kind known to us indirectly through the early patristic writers. Thirdly, a primitive harmony of the Synoptic sayings of Jesus.

In order to explain the close agreements between Matthew and Luke

¹ Jeremias points out that in the patristic writers sayings were often erroneously attributed to Jesus. *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*², p. 32.

in non-Markan sayings of Jesus, the hypothesis of a written sayings source, commonly designated Q, is widely held. The contents of Q, according to the hypothesis, would have been largely limited to the words of Jesus which were taken up by Matthew and Luke in accordance with their own purposes, thereby accounting for the remarkable verbatim agreement so often found between the two Gospels. Is it possible that this pre-Synoptic sayings source remained in circulation in the early Church alongside the Synoptics and exercised an influence on the form of the sayings of Jesus recorded in the Apostolic Fathers?

A. Resch argues for the existence of a pre-Synoptic source, somewhat larger in scope than Q, as traditionally defined, in the form of a Hebrew *Urevangelium*.¹ This primitive gospel was allegedly what Papias referred to in the words *Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο*, and was partially taken up into each of the Synoptic Gospels in Greek translation, even as Papias indicated, *ἡρμηνεύσεν δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατός ἕκαστος*.² Resch further contends that this Hebrew *Quellenschrift* had wide circulation, being known not only to the authors of the Synoptics, but also to others in the early Church. He thus not only can trace back a number of *agrapha* to this document, but also by the vagaries of translation explain the different form of Jesus' sayings both in the Synoptics and in the Apostolic Fathers. However, Resch's interpretation of the phenomena involves considerable difficulty. Not only is there no evidence to substantiate his theory, but the idea of a single Hebrew *Quellenschrift* is by no means easy to reconcile with the particular data which called forth the Q hypothesis. Since its initial premise is questionable, Resch's deductive methodology is unsatisfactory. To claim that the text-form of the sayings of Jesus found in the Apostolic Fathers is the result of translational variants, is to read the evidence in the light of an already accepted conclusion.

Another who has attempted to explain the sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers on the basis of a pre-Synoptic written source is J. P. Brown.³ Brown argues that the form of Q known to Matthew was a church-revision of the original Q found in Luke. With no small amount of ingenuity, he finds "echoes" of this revision of Q (called

¹ *Agrapha*¹, especially pp. 27-75.

² Recorded by Eusebius, *HE* III, 39, 16.

³ "The Form of 'Q' Known to Matthew", *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 27-42.

QMt) in Clement (13.2) and among other of the Apostolic Fathers.¹ On the basis of his theory, Brown can account for the numerous Matthean contacts in the sayings, as given by the Fathers, which previously Massaux had used to support his thesis of the priority and popularity of the Gospel of Matthew. The difficulty with Brown's argument is not simply that it necessarily falls short of demonstration, but that it only exists by adding subtle conjectures to an argument which is already conjectural.

While we may allow that the Q hypothesis is the most probable explanation of the agreements between Matthew and Luke, it must be remembered that beyond this there is little agreement as to the precise contents of Q.² Sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers can thus hardly be explained on the basis of Q, if they depart from its agreed contents (i.e. if they differ from Matthew and Luke). It seems more probable that Q was early replaced by the written Synoptics than that it survived together with them into the second century. A second difficulty with the alleged influence of Q on into the second century is that of explaining its sudden disuse and disappearance, especially in view of its apparently apostolic origin.³ Harnack carefully examined the possibility that Q lies behind the sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers and wisely concluded "We cannot tell how long this compilation [Q] remained in existence. Its traces in St. Clement of Rome and in writers after his time are not certain".⁴ The main problem with this hypothesis, then, is simply that it is impossible to substantiate. Since there are other possible explanations of the sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers, the *onus probandi* rests with the proponent

¹ "Wherever the Q-tradition is known from Paul and Mark through the second century, it is known in some form of the church-revision of Q ... rather than of original Q". *Ibid.*, p. 38.

² Stewart Petrie has called attention to the bewildering array of opinions concerning Q, and the lack of objectivity in establishing its identity. "'Q' Is Only What You make It", *Nov. Test.* 3 (1959), 28-33. Jeremias regards the $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ of Lk. 1.1 as "purely rhetorical" and concludes that "the written 'sayings source' is in our opinion pure fantasy". *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*², p. 3, n. 1. See also "Zur Hypothese einer schriftlichen Logionquelle Q", *ZNTW* 29 (1930), 147-149, where Jeremias suggests that oral tradition better explains the agreements between Matthew and Luke.

³ T. W. Manson's explanation, i.e. the imminent *parousia* and lack of interest in an Aramaic Q, is possible, but seems rather improbable. *The Sayings of Jesus* (London, 1949), p. 19f.

⁴ *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 251. W. Bousset, however, goes so far as to suggest Q as the source of the sayings of Jesus in Justin Martyr. *Op. cit.*, p. 114.

of Q. But, as Harnack notes, "with Resch and others of his way of thinking one seeks in vain for real proofs".¹

An alternative solution involves a written *λόγοι* source which is either independent of the Synoptics (i.e. not used by them) or directly dependent upon the Synoptics, and which is thereby immune from the disadvantages of a document which must also satisfy the evident requirements of Synoptic source-criticism. Such a collection of sayings may have been culled from oral tradition or from the Synoptics, perhaps for catechetical purposes. There is tangible evidence for such collections of sayings of Jesus which may be seen in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1, 654 and 655 discovered by Grenfell and Hunt,² as well as in the Gospel of Thomas discovered at Nag Hammadi (not to be confused with the apocryphal Gospel of Thomas).³ In Pap. Ox. 654 the preface of a collection is preserved in which the sayings of Jesus are specifically introduced as *λόγοι*, and in both Pap. Ox. 654 and 1 the sayings are individually introduced with the formula λέγει Ἰησοῦς. As it happens, all the sayings of these three papyri are found, though not exactly, in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas which consists entirely of sayings of Jesus, and this has led to the probable conclusion that the former reflect the original Greek text which underlies the Coptic translation of this "Gospel".⁴ The papyri date from the end of the second century, the Coptic Gospel of Thomas from about 400, and its Greek original probably around the middle of the second century. Apart from the question of the proximate source of this collection of sayings and others like it which we may suppose existed in the second century—that is, whether it is dependent upon or independent of our Synoptic Gospels—Can we account for the sayings of Jesus recorded

¹ *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 193.

² B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus* (London, 1904); *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, I (London, 1898), 1ff.; IV (London, 1904), 1-28. For convenient introduction and translations, see also E. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, trans. R. McL. Wilson, I (London, 1963), 97-113.

³ See Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, 278-307; 511-522.

⁴ G. Quispel, however, contends that the sayings in the Gospel of Truth, along with apparently related ones in the Pseudo-Clementines, themselves were taken from a Jewish-Christian gospel. "The Gospel of Thomas and the NT", *VC* 11 (1957), 190. In answer to Quispel, H.-W. Bartsch has shown that many of the sayings may in fact be regarded as expansions of Synoptic sayings. "Das Thomas-Evangelium und die Synoptischen Evangelien", *NTS* 6 (1959-60), 249-261.

in the Apostolic Fathers by claiming dependence upon some such written collection?

K. Lake, writing just after the discovery of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, suggested that such a collection could explain the form of sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers, but he perhaps went astray in wanting to find in the same collection a source used by the Synoptic writers.¹ Since the Gospel of Truth is so rich in *agrapha* (half of the sayings are without Synoptic parallels) it is tempting to trace *agrapha* in later writers back to this or a similar collection of sayings. Köster makes this suggestion for a few sayings in 2 Clement (4.5; 5.2ff; 8.5).² However, it is possible, at least, to relate the majority of sayings in the Apostolic Fathers to canonical sayings and, since the Synoptic Gospels themselves provide a ready source for the latter, it is precarious to explain them on the basis of other sources without further, more direct evidence.

In addition to the possible use of a distinctive sayings-collection, we must consider a second, related possibility in the form of apocryphal gospels, writings which presumably contained narrative sections in addition to sayings of Jesus.³ The canonical Gospels, individually or collectively, did not exhaust the varied traditions concerning the words and deeds of Jesus (cf. Jn. 21.25). These traditions were gradually taken up into other gospels so that "by about the middle of the second century the Church was confronted with a bewildering variety of gospels".⁴ Occasionally, stories were created on the one hand to fill in gaps left by the canonical Gospels, as in the case of the infancy gospels, or on the other hand, to elaborate details already well known, as in the passion gospels. Other gospels were created in order to find in the teaching of Jesus an authorization for Gnostic leanings of certain sections of the Church. Because of the unabashed creativity which lay behind them, one looks in vain for authentic, early tradition in these types of gospels. Moreover, the distinctive character of these gospels all but precludes finding in them the source of the sayings of Jesus found in the Apostolic Fathers, the latter being more neutral or

¹ "The New Sayings of Jesus and the Synoptic Problem", *HJ* 3 (1904-05), 332-341.

² *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 110f.

³ The use of the title "gospel" with the Nag Hammadi discoveries, the Gospel of Truth and the Gospel of Thomas (thus entitled in the colophon), is perhaps misleading since rather than being "gospels" in the ordinary sense of the word, the former is a homily and the latter a collection of sayings of Jesus.

⁴ Jeremias, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*², p. 3.

Synoptic in tone. More significant are the early so-called Jewish-Christian apocryphal gospels.

Direct evidence for these earlier gospels is very fragmentary. Of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, numbers 840 and 1224 probably trace back to such early apocryphal gospels, as does the Papyrus Egerton 2 (evidently based on the four canonical Gospels) discovered by Bell and Skeat.¹ It is also possible that among the Oxyrhynchus Papyri mentioned earlier (1, 654, 655) we may have evidence of apocryphal gospels, if only the larger context of the sayings were known.

The indirect evidence for the early apocryphal gospels, although not completely consistent, is comparatively impressive. The best attested of these is the "Gospel of (or, according to) the Hebrews" which is quoted explicitly by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* II, 9, 45) and Origen (*in Joh. Hom.* II, 12), and referred to by Eusebius (*HE* III, 25, 5; 27), who also suggests that it was known to Hegesippus (*HE* IV, 22, 8) and at least implies that Papias knew it (*HE* III, 29, 17). Epiphanius mentions the Gospel according to the Hebrews (*Haer.* 30, 3, 7) but he in one place confusingly seems to identify it with Tatian's Diatessaron (*Haer.* 46, 1), whereas elsewhere the Gospel he refers to seems uniquely Ebionite. Even more bewildering, however, is the witness of Jerome who frequently refers to a Gospel according to the Hebrews (e.g. *Comm. on Micah* [7.6]; *de Vir. Ill.* 2) or more simply "the Hebrew Gospel" (e.g. *Comm. on Eph.* [5.4]) which was apparently understood by some to be the Hebrew original of Matthew (*de Vir. Ill.* 3), and which is supposed to have been used both by the Nazarenes and Ebionites (*Comm. on Mt.* [12.13]). Have we one Jewish-Christian gospel known under several names? Or have we two (i.e. one Greek and one Aramaic) or three distinct, though similar gospels: a Gospel of the Hebrews, a Gospel of the Ebionites and/or a Gospel of the Nazarenes? The problem is complex and the testimony of the Fathers enigmatic² but for our present purposes there is no need to pursue it further.

In addition to the Gospel of the Hebrews and the related possibilities, two further early apocryphal gospels deserve mention as possible sources for sayings of Jesus found in the Apostolic Fathers. Clement of

¹ H. I. Bell and T. C. Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and other Early Christian Papyri* (London, 1935).

² For a full discussion of the evidence, see P. Vielhauer, "Jewish-Christian Gospels", in Hennecke-Schneemelcher I, 117-165. Vielhauer favours the hypothesis of three independent gospels.

Alexandria explicitly cites (*Stromata* III, 63), and Origen mentions (in *Luc. Hom.* I, [on Lk. 1.1]),¹ the "Gospel of the Egyptians" (not the same as the Coptic gospel by the same name discovered at Nag Hammadi). Another gospel, the Gospel of Peter, is mentioned by Origen (*Comm. on Mt.* X, 17), and by Eusebius (*HE* III, 3; III, 25), according to whom Serapion was also acquainted with the gospel (*HE* VI, 12). A considerable fragment of this second gospel was discovered in Egypt in 1886 from which it is evident that the gospel is largely dependent on our canonical Gospels.²

Having briefly mentioned the particular early apocryphal gospels known to us which look most promising as possible sources used by the Apostolic Fathers, we must now ask whether the sayings of Jesus found in the latter can successfully be explained on the basis of these gospels or others similar to them, but presently unknown. One of the attractive things about this hypothesis is the abundant evidence that such gospels were actually in circulation in the early Church. From a very early time they were looked upon as possible sources of material in the Apostolic Fathers. Thus Jerome assigns an apparently non-canonical saying found in Ignatius (*Smyrn.* 3.2), λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον to a gospel which he translated (*de Vir.* III. 16), identified earlier as "evangelium quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos" (*de Vir.* III. 2). The saying is also clearly referred to the Gospel of the Hebrews in his *Comm. on Isaiah* (XVIII, preface). However, considerable confusion has been caused by these remarks of Jerome since neither Origen nor Eusebius refers the saying to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, although both clearly knew the gospel. Origen attributes the saying to another apocryphal writing "qui Petri Doctrina appellatur" (*de Princ. praef.* 8). Origen does not have much respect for this pseudonymous writing, which is late and either depended on Ignatius for the saying or (more probably) derived it independently from an apocryphal gospel. Eusebius, on the other hand, pleads ignorance as to the source of the quotation, οὐκ οἶδ' ὁπόθεν ῥητοῖς συγκέχρηται (*HE* III, 36, 11). If

¹ In this same passage Origen, commenting on Luke's πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν mentions other gospels known to him including "the Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles", as well as the Gospels of Thomas, Matthias, and Basilides.

² Swete, *The Akhmim Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter* (London, 1893). Zahn suggested that the Gospel of the Egyptians and the Gospel of Peter were closely related, *GNTK* II, 635f., but D. Völter's claim that they were identical is not tenable. "Petrus-evangelium oder Ägypter-evangelium?" *ZNTW* 6 (1905), 368-372.

Jerome is not mistaken about the source of the passage, then he must have been using a different recension of the Gospel of the Hebrews which did contain the saying in question.¹ Jerome, however, is known to make mistakes, indeed as he does in assigning our saying to Ignatius' Epistle to Polycarp (*de Vir. Ill.* 16).² In view of the conflicting evidence it is difficult to come to a conclusion concerning the source of the saying, especially since Eusebius, although in a far better position to make an assessment than we are, was unable to determine the source. It is quite possible that Ignatius is simply giving a free paraphrase of Lk. 24.39 in keeping with his habit of quotation elsewhere.³ On the other hand, if it does not seem safe to dismiss completely the evidence of Origen and Jerome,⁴ it cannot be determined with any certainty which, if any, of the apocryphal gospels contained the saying. Nonetheless, a number of modern scholars have built ingenious hypotheses in the attempt to establish Ignatius' use of a Jewish-Christian gospel, whether that of the Hebrews, of the Nazarenes, or of the Ebionites.⁵

In 2 Cl. 12.2 a non-canonical saying of Jesus appears which was also known to Clement of Alexandria (who quotes it, however, via a certain Cassianus).

2 Clement 12.2

ὁ κύριος ... εἶπεν ·

ὅταν ἔσται

τὰ δύο ἐν,

καὶ τὸ ἕξ ὡς τὸ ἕσω,

καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας,

οὔτε ἄρσεν οὔτε θῆλυ.

Stromata III, 92, 2

ἔφη ὁ κύριος ·

ὅταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνῃς

ἔνδυμα πατήσητε καὶ

ὅταν γένηται

τὰ δύο ἐν,

καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας,

οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ.

Clement of Alexandria adds ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέτταρσιν εὐαγγελίοις οὐκ ἔχομεν τὸ ῥητόν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους. It

¹ Lightfoot thinks this to be the more probable explanation of the contradictory witnesses. II, 2, 295.

² Cf. also his erroneous attribution of Barn. 5.9 to Ignatius. *Contra Pelag.* III, 2.

³ Vielhauer writes "In my opinion the antidocetic tendency of Ignatius and the actual front-line in which he stood sufficiently explain the formulation of the sayings of the Lord and make the assumption of any source other than Lk. 24.36ff. unnecessary". Hennecke-Schneemelcher I, 130.

⁴ Cf. the hesitancy of the Oxford Committee, *NTAF*, p. 80 and Grant, *The Formation of the NT*, p. 102.

⁵ For an account of these (mainly German) scholars, see Köster, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 50-56. Köster himself decides in favour of "freie Überlieferung".

seems there can be little doubt that the two sayings are ultimately derived from the same source, so that if the Alexandrian's notice is correct, the author of 2 Clement may well have made use of the Gospel of the Egyptians.¹ Here too, however, complications arise since almost the same saying is found in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas (logion 22; cf. 37) and partially in Fragment Ib of Pap. Ox. 655. Thus 2 Clement and the Gospel of the Egyptians may have independently derived the saying from an early collection of sayings of Jesus, perhaps the Gospel of Thomas.² Accordingly, it remains impossible to demonstrate that 2 Clement is here dependent upon the Gospel of the Egyptians. If this is true, then attempts to assign other sayings of Jesus in 2 Clement to the Gospel of the Egyptians are necessarily speculative.³ The majority of these sayings are traceable to the Synoptics; for the few others, such as in 4.5 and 5.2-4, the use of an apocryphal gospel (or more than one) remains a valid possibility, but with the present lack of evidence nothing more than this may be said.

Thus even for the two passages in the Apostolic Fathers (Ign. *Smyrn.* 3.2; 2 Cl. 12.2) for which we have external evidence apparently indicating dependence upon apocryphal gospels, we are surprisingly unable to arrive at any firm conclusion. This difficulty increases in attempting to account for other sayings of Jesus (often explainable on the basis of the Synoptics) in the Apostolic Fathers by means of apocryphal gospels,⁴ and those who do so are necessarily confined to specious arguments.⁵ Our evidence for these gospels is so fragmentary, and their apparent relationship so bewilderingly complex that almost any hypothesis can be successfully argued, and thus a proportionate amount of caution should be observed in designating apocryphal gospels as the source of sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers.⁶

¹ Thus Lightfoot I, 2, 202, but in 1890, before the discovery of various other parallels.

² Schneemelcher suggests some such relationship between the Gospels of Thomas and the Egyptians. Hennecke-Schneemelcher I, 174. Cf. H.-Ch. Puech, *ibid.*, p. 298f.

³ Harnack traced the majority of gospel sayings in 2 Clement to the Gospel of the Egyptians. *Über die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu* (Leipzig, 1897).

⁴ Lightfoot writes "This absence of any unmistakable traces of a New Testament Apocrypha in the Apostolic Fathers is the more remarkable, because the references to pre-Christian apocryphal writings are not infrequent". I, 1, 11. Cf. Zahn, *Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 39.

⁵ E.g., H. Waitz alleges that Barnabas made use of the Gospel of the Nazarenes. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*² (Tübingen, 1924), p. 17ff.

⁶ In the apocryphal gospel we are faced with a kind of *x*-Evangelium which Volkmar likened "in seiner Unbegreiflichkeit und Gestaltlosigkeit den unheimlichen Eindruck eines Gespenstes". Quoted by Bousset, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

Can some of the sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers be accounted for on the basis of an early harmony of the Synoptic sayings of Jesus? Unfortunately, the existence of early harmonies is equally shrouded in darkness. Evidence of pre-Tatianic harmonies is sparse and disputable. A. J. Bellinzoni,¹ following Köster, his mentor, has argued that a number of the sayings of Jesus quoted by Justin Martyr are explainable only on the basis of his use of a gospel harmony.² According to Bellinzoni, gospel harmonies were already commonplace in the time of Justin, and evidence for this can be seen in 2 Clement.³ Can we push the use of such a harmony even earlier than this? The Oxford Committee suggested the use of a harmony as a possible explanation of certain sayings in the Didache;⁴ and this hypothesis has occasionally been applied to other of the Apostolic Fathers as well. Again, however, we are in the realm of conjecture. Any mixture of Synoptic material will have a harmonistic appearance, without necessarily being dependent on a harmony. Several writings bear an apparent relationship to the Diatessaron. G. Quispel has contended that a relationship exists between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron.⁵ K. A. Credner earlier concluded that Justin had used the Gospel according to Peter (= Gospel according to the Hebrews, for Credner) which was essentially identical with the Diatessaron.⁶ There is a resemblance between the sayings recorded in Clement of Alexandria, Origen, the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies, and Justin which has led Bellinzoni to allege the dependence of all of them upon the same harmonistic tradition. The similarities between Justin and 2 Clement however are explained on the basis of two similar, but independent, harmonies.⁷ These and other similar views reveal the confusion which exists concerning early harmonies. It is virtually impossible with the present data to distinguish fortuitous from significant agreements, and to discern genuine relation-

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 89-91; 96-97; 265.

² Sanday also leaned towards this hypothesis. *The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 136. Cf. J. R. Harris who, speaking of Tatian, writes, "there must have been a previously existing harmony probably a harmony of the Passion-Gospels". *The Diatessaron of Tatian* (Cambridge, 1890), p. 54.

³ The sayings of Jesus in 2 Clement indicate "that there were in use before Justin's period written gospel harmonies, which served as models for the harmonies used and perhaps composed by Justin". Bellinzoni, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

⁴ *NTAF*, p. 35; see also p. 125 for the same suggestion concerning 2 Clement.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 193f.

⁶ *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ed. G. Volkmar (Berlin, 1860), p. 21f.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 142.

ships from apparent ones in any attempt to substantiate hypotheses concerning early harmonies. The use of early harmonies by the Apostolic Fathers remains a possibility deserving of consideration, but necessarily falls short of demonstration, and indeed, in the light of other possibilities appears rather improbable.

The biggest drawback then of explaining the sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers on the basis of extra-canonical written sources is our inability to demonstrate probable dependence.¹ Added to this lack of proof is the plausibility of the other available explanations, e.g. memory, as in the use of the epistles, and oral tradition which we have yet to look at. Yet these written sources must be kept in mind as possibilities, especially where we are confronted with sayings of Jesus which differ more markedly from those of the Synoptics. Such extra-canonical sources, whether a written sayings-collection, an apocryphal gospel, or a primitive harmony, could quite conceivably account for the two groups of sayings of Jesus found in Clement's epistle (13.2; 46.8), but the explanation would only amount to pure conjecture. What is needed in this field of extra-canonical written sources is not more intricate hypotheses but the discovery of new materials which will add to the meager data presently available.

4. *Oral Tradition*

Where we are faced with difficulty in determining source, as in the sayings of Jesus recorded in the Apostolic Fathers, a final possible explanation remains to be considered. Oral tradition by its very nature is the least tangible of the alternative hypotheses, but there is good evidence that it played an important role in the early Church.

The Swedish scholars H. Riesenfeld² and B. Gerhardsson³ have recently emphasized anew the central importance of oral transmission in the recording of the Gospel tradition. Concerned primarily with the period between the original utterance of Jesus' sayings and their appearance in the written Gospels, Riesenfeld and Gerhardsson have paralleled this oral transmission with the transmission of oral Torah

¹ This inability is underlined by the fact that the contents of these sources quite probably overlapped to a large degree. Streeter has called attention to this phenomenon, though in a slightly different connection. *The Four Gospels*, p. 238f.

² *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings*.

³ *Memory and Manuscript*; see also *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*, *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* XX (Lund, 1964).

within Rabbinic Judaism. The scrupulous care with which the Rabbis memorized the oral law would, according to Gerhardsson, have been duplicated in the disciples' mastery of the teaching of Jesus.¹ Can such oral tradition parallel to the written Gospels have persisted on into the second century, and with a similar degree of accuracy? Gerhardsson suggests that this is the case, and that the Gospels were not so much regarded as "Scripture" as they were "tradition" and that up to the middle of the second century they functioned orally.² It is questionable however whether in the Apostolic Fathers the supposed unity of this oral tradition ("Holy Word") and accuracy of its transmission can be supported by an appeal to Rabbinic practices. The fact that the leaders of the early Church regarded themselves as bearers of tradition does not guarantee their use of Rabbinic methods. W. D. Davies has thus criticized Gerhardsson for presupposing a uniformity of tradition (a fixed "Holy Word") and for failing on the basis of his argument to account for variations in the text of the recorded tradition in the Apostolic Fathers.³

Apart from these difficulties, however, there can be no question concerning the currency of oral tradition in the second century. Two passages recorded in Eusebius give evidence of its persistence. First there is the well-known passage in which Papias expresses his preference for tradition going back to the original disciples, adding οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης (HE III, 39, 4). Although this statement cannot be taken as an authorization of the permanent superiority of oral tradition over the written Scriptures,⁴ it does demonstrate the availability of, and interest in, oral tradition at the beginning of the second century.⁵ In the second passage Irenaeus recounts the privilege which was his in learning from Polycarp who had known eyewitnesses of

¹ See *Memory and Manuscript*, pp. 324-335.

² *Ibid.*, p. 202.

³ "Reflections on a Scandinavian Approach to 'Gospel Tradition'" in *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge, 1964), pp. 464-480, found also in *Neotestamentica et Patristica*, ed. W. C. van Unnik (Leiden, 1962), pp. 14-34. Gerhardsson, however, contends that Davies has misunderstood him at this point. *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*, p. 40, n. 91.

⁴ See R. P. C. Hanson's just criticism of Van den Eynde on this point. *Tradition in the Early Church* (London, 1962), p. 38.

⁵ The importance of memory in the handing down of both true and foreign traditions is earlier indicated in the words οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς μνημονεύουσιν· ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου (HE III, 39, 3).

Jesus' ministry. He tells how Polycarp ἀπεμνημόνευεν τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν, and how he had learned from them the things περὶ τοῦ κυρίου ... καὶ περὶ τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας. Irenaeus says, in turn, ταῦτα καὶ τότε διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἐπ' ἐμοὶ γεγονὸς σπουδαίως ἤκουον, ὑπομνηματιζόμενος αὐτὰ οὐκ ἐν χάριτι, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ καρδίᾳ · καὶ αἰεὶ διὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ γνησίως αὐτὰ ἀναμαρτυκῶμαι (HE V, 20, 6f.). Again, this time far into the second century and from one who stressed the significance of *four* Gospels, we have an acknowledgment of the importance of oral tradition.

Oral tradition, then, persisted after the writing of the Gospels, paralleling the written tradition, and at times supplementing it. Gerhards-son's statement seems an accurate estimate of the situation as it was at the beginning: "It appears unnatural to regard living traditional material as something written, simply because written versions have come into being".¹ Eventually, with the passing of time, the written tradition began to supersede the oral tradition, as R. P. C. Hanson has pointed out, yet "the situation of the Church in the years *circa* 60 to *circa* 160 AD is precisely this one, when written and oral tradition are circulating in the Church side by side".² This being the case, oral tradition must be given serious consideration as the possible explanation of sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers.

A main utilization of oral tradition in the first two centuries appears to have been in the catechizing of new converts, particularly as a preparation for baptism, but perhaps afterwards as well. The Christian use of catechisms in connection with baptism was probably modelled after the similar Jewish practice in proselyte baptism.³ Of primary importance for the new convert was ethical catechesis, or the impartation of what has been called "Christian Halakha".⁴ Examinations of this early Christian ethical catechesis have not agreed on its specific

¹ *Memory and Manuscript*, p. 199. Cf. Westcott, "Those who had heard the living voice of Apostles, were unlikely to appeal to their written words". *History of the Canon*, p. 47. See also the remarks of C. H. Roberts in *CHB* I, 49.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

³ Sanday writes "Converts to Christianity, especially converts from heathenism, underwent a short course of instruction, similar to that which the Jews were in the habit of imparting to their proselytes, and consisting mainly of simple moral teaching". *Inspiration* (London, 1894), p. 302. See Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism*, p. 13ff. Also D. Daube, *The NT and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 1956), pp. 106-140.

⁴ A. M. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors* (London, 1940), p. 62. Carrington carries the parallel further by speaking of a succession of "Tannaite Elders" in the first two centuries, dedicated to the transmission of oral tradition. *Op. cit.*, p. 69f.

contents, other than that it generally resembled the paraenesis found in the NT. The various attempts to determine the underlying schema of the catechesis have proved artificial and unsatisfactory.¹ It is clear, however, that in ethical teaching the actual words of Jesus would have been supremely revered. Indeed, it has been shown that the paraenesis of the early Church was largely based upon sayings of Jesus.² By memory the catechumens were taught the *traditio orationis dominicae* and they in turn committed it to memory.³

The sayings of Jesus comprising this oral tradition have left their mark on the epistles of the NT.⁴ In 1 Thes. 4.16 we apparently have a saying of Jesus which was not recorded in the Gospels. More interesting than this, however, is the saying recorded in Acts 20.35, *μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν · μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν*. In this saying, lacking in the Gospels, Paul may well allude to a traditional piece of ethical catechesis. The short, aphoristic character of the saying, and the introductory formula with its emphasis on "remembering", tend to corroborate this interpretation. Speaking to the Ephesian elders, the custodians of the tradition, Paul could very appropriately have brought home his argument by citing a saying of Jesus from the elementary catechesis.

If this is a plausible explanation of Acts 20.35, it seems even more so in the case of the sayings recorded in Clement and Polycarp. The very form of the sayings in Cl. 13.2 and Polycarp 2.3 indicates that they were designed for memorization.⁵ This, together with the intro-

¹ D. A. Seeberg, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit* (Leipzig, 1903), sees the ethical catechesis summed up in "the Way", the contents of which are found in the sin- and virtue-catalogues of the early tradition; Carrington (*op. cit.*), finds a four-fold pattern of paraenesis which he summarizes under the headings, *Deponentes*, *Subiecti*, *Vigilate*, and *Resistite* (alternatively *State*); Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, in a long essay (pp. 363-466), begins with Carrington's analysis, but expands it to a sixfold pattern which he develops rather differently.

² See C. H. Dodd, "The 'Primitive Catechism' and the Sayings of Jesus" in *More New Testament Studies* (Manchester, 1968), pp. 11-29. Cf. Seeberg, who writes, "Der Katechismus bestand also durchweg aus Worten Christi". *Op. cit.*, p. 248.

³ Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, p. 203. Sanday mentions that the catechetical material would have been freely structured "within a given framework or on a given model" which would become so familiar that "a Christian writer would fall unconsciously into it". *Inspiration*, p. 302.

⁴ For Paul, see especially Hunter, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-61. For 1 Peter and other epistles, see Selwyn, *op. cit.*, table II (pp. 376-378) and table XIV (pp. 442-449).

⁵ This holds true even if Polycarp is dependent upon Clement. Köster writes that the form of the sayings in Cl. 13.2 is to be explained by the fact "dass die Gemeinde Lehr-

ductory formulae (Clement: *μνημονεύοι*; Polycarp: *μνημονεύοντες*), indicates that we are here confronted with material handed down orally.¹ The content of the sayings, moreover, is exactly what one would have expected to find in ethical catechesis suitable for new converts to master. The same may be said of the sayings in 46.8, though this is admittedly a less conspicuous example so far as form itself is concerned; the content, however, is appropriate for new converts.

While this oral catechesis was no doubt basically similar throughout the Church, we need not presuppose an absolute uniformity for the tradition. It may well have varied in different places and periods.² Nor, indeed, when oral catechesis appears in the writings of the early Church was it always introduced with a formula indicating the peculiar "remembering" process connected with it. (The saying in Acts 20.35 is found also in Cl. 2.1, probably via oral catechesis, without indication, rather than by dependence upon Acts.) Oral tradition may thus possibly account for the form (and content) of sayings of Jesus found in the Apostolic Fathers. But caution is due here, since the explanation of sayings on the basis of oral tradition is as easily subject to abuse as is that of memory.

In addition to its importance in the transmission of sayings of Jesus, oral catechesis may conceivably account for certain similarities in the paraenetic material found in the NT epistles and the Apostolic Fathers. Indeed, so striking is the agreement in the ethical and hortatory sections of certain of the Pauline epistles, and in parts of 1 Peter, James and Hebrews, as well as Clement and the Apostolic Fathers, that the question not only of oral catechesis, but more generally the whole question of common tradition in the early Church is raised. How is the common material of these various epistles to be explained?

und Unterrichtsstoff brauchte, einen Katechismus". "Die ausserkanonischen Herrenworte als Produkte der christlichen Gemeinde". *ZNTW* 48 (1957), 224.

¹ In these passages and in Acts 20.35, the main verb of the introductory formula is *ἐμνήν*. Westcott calls attention to this in the following words, "the mode in which Clement refers to our Lord's teaching, 'the Lord said', not 'saith', seems to imply that he was indebted to tradition, and not to any written accounts, for words most closely resembling those which are still found in our Gospels". *History of the Canon*, p. 52. Stanton also calls attention to the catechetical nature of Cl. 13.2. *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, p. 10.

² Streeter appropriately asks "Why should it not have been the local Roman collection of sayings from which Clement seems to quote?" *The Four Gospels*, p. 232, n. 1; cf. *ibid.*, p. 238f. Although Streeter is referring to a written source, there is no reason why the collection may not have been an oral one.

While it may be possible to account for the similar material in the Pauline epistles on the basis of common authorship, or direct dependence upon those epistles in the case of deutero-Pauline epistles, how can the similar material in 1 Peter, James, Hebrews and Clement be explained?

The trend of modern scholarship, especially that emanating from Germany, is to reject the possibility of direct literary dependence in favour of the common use of traditional materials. The earlier work of Drews, Dibelius, Bousset and Knopf,¹ has more recently been developed, in their various ways, by Thyen, Knoch and Beyschlag. The work of these scholars stresses different aspects (liturgical, homiletical, paraenetic) of the underlying tradition common to the writings of the early Church. H. Thyen finds in the homiletic character of these writings a reflection of the form of synagogue preaching in Hellenistic Judaism.² Common material in various writings is explained on the basis of homiletic convention; this is true particularly of the material in Clement's epistle,³ for which Thyen disallows literary dependence.⁴ Knoch, in his discussion of Clement's sources, explains much common material by means of various strands of tradition, and yet does not

¹ Reference has already been made to the work of Drews, Dibelius and Knopf in the preceding chapters. For Knopf, in addition to his commentary in HZNT, see *Der Erste Clemensbrief* TU 20 (Leipzig, 1899), p. 178ff. For Bousset, see especially his *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom* (Göttingen, 1915). Bousset sees Clement's epistle as largely consisting of homiletic materials in use at Rome which have been adapted to apply to the situation at Corinth (p. 308ff.). The epistle thus contains common tradition of the early Church: "sehen wir auch hier wie 'Literatur' sich aus fixierten mündlichen Vorträgen gestaltet" (p. 311).

² *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie* (Göttingen, 1955). Thyen's work is closely modelled on, and presents conclusions similar to, R. Bultmann's *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (Göttingen, 1910). On homiletical fragments in Clement, see also L. Lemarchand, "La Composition de l'Épître de Saint Clément aux Corinthiens", *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 18 (1938), 448-457.

³ Thyen refers to the conclusions of P. Wendland approvingly. Wendland had written of Clement: "Die Haustafel, der Lasterkatalog, Themata der Paulusbriefe und des Hebräer- und ersten Petrusbriefes, Beispiel- und Zitate-reihen aus dem AT, liturgische Stücke sind traditionelle Elemente, die er in seiner Art ausgestaltet". *Die urchristliche Literaturformen*, HZNT I/3 (Tübingen, 1912), p. 378.

⁴ "Dennoch ist der ganze Brief hinsichtlich seines Stiles und seiner Sprache durchaus einheitlich, sodass mit schriftlichen Quellen nicht zu rechnen ist". *Op. cit.*, p. 12. But there is no reason why Clement may not give materials derived from written sources in his own words; moreover, if Thyen's argument is correct he cannot have made use of oral sources either.

go so far as to deny literary dependence in many instances.¹ Beyschlag, the most recent writer on Clement, has strongly asserted the role played by *Gemeindetradition* in Clement's epistle. He indicates the presence of three strands of tradition: martyrdom, paraenesis, and church order.² In a similar way, the relation between Hebrews, James and Clement (he adds also 2 Clement, the Didache, 1 Peter and the Pastorals) points to the fact "dass dem Ganzen eine einheitliche Gesamtüberlieferung zugrunde liegt".³ Even when the written sources were available, literary dependence is rejected by Beyschlag in favour of tradition.⁴ As Dibelius earlier argued that the parallels between James and Clement were due to a common paraenetic tradition,⁵ so more recently has E. Lohse explained the parallels between 1 Peter and Clement by claiming that "in beiden Briefen wird überlieferte Paränese aufgenommen und verarbeitet".⁶ Paraenetic passages in Clement which are paralleled in the Pauline Epistles are capable of the same explanation. Seeberg, for example, investigated the sin-catalogue of Cl. 35.5 to see if it could be traced directly to early catechesis rather than Rom. 1.29ff. Although unable to deny the dependence upon Romans, he was able to suggest that its particular form in Clement, with the various omissions and additions, was explained by the influence of oral catechesis.⁷

Comparable to the approach of these German scholars is that of Ropes who explains the relation between James and 1 Peter on the basis of a common literary background, and denies that there is any closer connection between James and Clement than simply "similar literary associations".⁸ In a similar manner, the British scholars Carrington and Selwyn have suggested that much of the common ma-

¹ *Eigenart und Bedeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufriß des ersten Clemensbriefs*, pp. 68-100.

² *Clemens Romanus und der Fröhenkatholizismus*, p. 344ff.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 347. Beyschlag prefers an oral source for the tradition, but writes, "Aber gleichviel, ob schriftliche oder mündliche Tradition: Über die Festigkeit der von Clemens bearbeiten Überlieferung kann jedenfalls kein Zweifel bestehen. (*Ibid.*)

⁴ "Vielmehr ist in allen diesen Fällen zwischen die bekannten und vorhandenen Quellen die unbekannte jüdisch-christliche Tradition einzusetzen". *Op. cit.*, p. 351.

⁵ *Der Brief des Jakobus*, p. 31.

⁶ "Paränese und Kerygma im 1. Petrusbrief", *ZNTW* 45 (1954), 68-89.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 34f. Seeberg restricted his enquiry to his framework of "Laster- und Tugendkataloge" (pp. 23-44).

⁸ *Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*, pp. 22f., 87.

terial in such epistles as 1 Peter, James and Hebrews can be accounted for by dependence upon a common Jewish (-Christian) catechesis¹. While they have not extended the argument to include the Apostolic Fathers, they might easily have done so.

While neither questioning the reality of the existence of various common elements of tradition nor doubting that this may account for certain general similarities in the content and form of early Christian writings, we find it difficult to disallow the probability of literary dependence in many instances. In our opinion, the recognition of the influence of tradition can only with difficulty displace the probability of literary dependence where it exists.²

The difficulty with the explanation of parallels on the basis of common underlying tradition, whether it be ethical, paraenetic, liturgical or homiletical, is that we are dealing with particularly ill-defined entities. Can we, for example, regard all ethical teaching as a part of the ethical catechesis? Is similarity of content enough to guarantee common derivation from a particular tradition of ethical catechesis? The concept of an ethical catechesis can become so inclusive that it loses its usefulness and also its plausibility. Allowance must be made for common features in ethical instruction due simply to the coincidental similarity of the material or even to an identity of source other than our specific tradition of ethical catechesis (e.g. the teaching of Jesus). Further, how uniform was this catechesis in different places and periods? Was the tradition stable enough to account for what is often nearly exact agreement in wording? Where we have close agreement of wording and the same sequence of ideas, whether between the epistles themselves (e.g. between James and 1 Peter; between 1 Peter and the Pauline Epistles) or between the Apostolic Fathers and the epistles, it is risky to appeal to oral catechesis as the explanation

¹ Carrington, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-29; Selwyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 458-466; for similar paraenetic tradition in Paul's epistles, see Hunter, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-68.

² The words of F. W. Beare are worth quoting at this point: "But it is well to keep in mind that even in the study of the Gospels, the use of techniques of form-criticism does not obliterate the facts of literary dependence; the most ardent form critic will be the first to admit the literary dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark, if not also on the hypothetical 'Q'. Even if the existence of catechetical and liturgical forms in the first century could be much more amply demonstrated, this would not rule out the facts of literary dependence, as of Ephesians on Colossians, and of 1 Peter on Ephesians". *The First Epistle of Peter*, p. 196. See the whole of his excursus, "The Quest of Source Materials or Forms Provided by the Common Tradition of the Church", *ibid.*, pp. 192-196. Cf. also C. L. Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 190f.

before definitely excluding the possibility of direct dependence. An oral tradition of ethical catechesis quite probably accounts for some of the basic similarities in question, but lacking more specific controls, caution demands that in many instances it be accorded no more than the status of possibility.

In our opinion, then, there is thus little justification for Beyschlag's utter skepticism concerning literary dependence¹ and his total confidence that parallels between Clement and the NT writings are to be explained on the basis of tradition. In reacting against alleged literary dependence, it appears that the role of tradition has been overemphasized. More probably allowance must be made for parallels due *both* to literary dependence *and* the common use of traditional materials.

To sum up, we have seen the difficulty of explaining the form of NT quotations in the Apostolic Fathers. Is the peculiar looseness of these allusions and quotations due simply to a free rendering of the canonical text from memory (or intentional stylistic variation)? Or is it due to the use of a tradition which parallels and even overlaps that encompassed in the canonical writings? For allusions to non-paraenetic material in the epistles an alternative source is virtually impossible and thus the former explanation is assured. For sayings of Jesus and paraenesis, however, not only are other sources conceivable, but evidence shows that they were readily available in the first two centuries. Thus for these allusions and quotations we must consider in addition to the possibility of quotation of the canonical sources by memory, the possible use of non-canonical written sources and oral tradition. Here the problem of source is intrinsically complex since all the suggested possibilities are pertinent, and accordingly, it is foolish to subsume these particular allusions, in the Apostolic Fathers as a group or even in one particular Father, under one heading. Rather, each allusion or quotation demands individual consideration, and even then the conclusion drawn must remain necessarily tentative.

¹ Beyschlag writes "Auf sicherem Boden befindet man sich lediglich dort, wo ein Schriftsteller, man denke an Euseb, seine literarischen Gewährsleute wirklich beim Namen nennt und wörtlich zitiert. In allen anderen Fällen ist Vorsicht am Platze". *Op. cit.*, p. 351. With this we agree, although we do not wish to identify caution with complete skepticism as Beyschlag does. A careful weighing of the evidence, in our opinion, leads to the conclusion that in many instances it is more probable that literary dependence explains the parallels than the use of traditional materials concerning which we have no precise guidelines.

While it is perhaps impossible to set down any universally valid principle(s), this much may be said. Keeping in mind that exactness of quotation was no desideratum for the Apostolic Fathers, there is an *a priori* probability that where substantial agreement exists the source for allusory material is the canonical writings of our NT. This initial probability is overthrown only by conclusive evidence that such dependence is altogether impossible, or clear marks supporting an alternative hypothesis. It may be added that dependence upon the canonical writings must be considered possible even where a *prima facie* evaluation seems to indicate otherwise.¹ All of this follows for the simple reason that while we know the actual contents of the canonical writings, there is by no means any similar assurance of the content of the other sources. Because of the inevitable vagueness of the latter there should be a reluctance to give them priority over an explanation on the basis of canonical sources except only for the most convincing of reasons. This we deem to be the case in the sayings of Jesus recorded in Clement, both because of the mnemonic form of the sayings and the formulae used to introduce them. There is, however, no place for dogmatism in such judgements, and source-criticism for much of the allusory material in the Apostolic Fathers remains an inextricable problem.

¹ Jeremias writes: "There are far more numerous instances of sayings which at first sight look new, but are really no more than expansions of sayings preserved in our Gospels. In most cases it is an amplification, a rhetorical embellishment, elucidation, improvement (e.g. of coarse expressions), sometimes inaccurate quotation or the harmonization of synoptic parallels, conflation of different logia, or the adjustment of a saying to some later situation in the Church". *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*¹, p. 26f. Cf. also H.-W. Bartsch who shows the sayings in the Gospel of Thomas thought to be dependent upon a non-canonical source can have been derived from the Synoptic Gospels. See above p. 296, n. 4.

CHAPTER NINE

CLEMENT'S VIEW OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS

Having examined the actual use of the NT writings in Clement's epistle, we are now able to extend our discussion to Clement's own evaluation of these writings. In particular, we shall examine the implications of Clement's use of certain NT writings for the prehistory of the Canon. This involves not only the question of the circulation of the writings and the possible existence of collections of them, but also the question of their authority and inspiration in comparison with that of the OT Scriptures. Lastly we shall look at the way in which Clement uses these writings and the interpretation he puts upon them.

A. PRE-CANONICAL COLLECTIONS

It is of course anachronistic to speak of a NT "canon" as early as the end of the first century. Yet we may legitimately investigate Clement's use of NT writings in the hope of finding information concerning the earliest beginnings of the canon. Before the concept of a "canon" of writings—with its descriptive and limitative functions¹—becomes possible, the writings concerned must be regarded as belonging together, and thus the actual collection of writings constitutes an important step towards their being recognized as canonical. In this connection the early use of the codex by Christians may well have played an important role, for it appears increasingly probable that the codex was used for Christian literature from the very beginning.² The inclusion

¹ On the word *κανών*, see Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, p. 21ff; Beyer, *TDNT* III, 596-602.

² The date for the earliest use of the codex has been pushed from the third to the second, and now to the first century. Thus H. A. Sanders writes "By the end of the first century B.C. and still more in the first century A.D. codices were appearing in the book trade. For the Christian literature, codices were probably used from the first". "The Beginnings of the Modern Book", *University of Michigan Quarterly Review* (1938), p. 109 (quoted by Goodspeed, *Christianity Goes to Press*, p. 71). Similarly, C. H. Roberts, in an important study of the subject, writes "so universal is the use of the codex by Christians in the second century that the beginnings of this process must be taken back well into the first century". "The Codex", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 40 (1954), 189. More recently,

of certain writings in a codex was able to provide a more tangible indication of the unity of a corpus than a collection of papyrus rolls.¹ Only with the codex was it possible to combine the four Gospels, or the Pauline epistles, in a single book.²

The evidence which exists, as we shall see, seems to indicate that the Pauline epistles were the first NT writings to be collected, and subsequently the Gospels and, more gradually, the remaining apostolic writings. The origins of these various collections are quite naturally obscure and it is very difficult to establish even an approximate date for their initial compilation. For this reason, it is wrong to let an *a priori* view of the beginnings of the canon predetermine one's evaluation of the evidence of the Apostolic Fathers, and particularly Clement of Rome. The question which must be asked is this: On the basis of the evidence afforded by Clement's use of these writings, what may be inferred concerning the earliest stages of the development of the NT canon?

1. *The Pauline Corpus*

There can be no doubt that Clement's witness to a knowledge of a good number of the Pauline epistles is of the highest importance. Clement, according to our study, reveals a knowledge of Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and possibly also 2 Corinthians and Colossians; additionally, there seems to be good evidence that Clement knew the Pastoral epistles. The interpretation of this evidence, however, is not without its difficulty. Had the writings already been intentionally collected to form a corpus, and did Clement have them together in one codex? If so, did that corpus include the Pastorals? Or does the evidence suggest a more haphazard collection,

T. C. Skeat has confirmed this conclusion of Roberts. Referring to the newly published fragment of a papyrus codex of Genesis (P. Yale 1) which is dated 80-100 AD, Skeat writes that if the suggested date is correct, "the origin of the Christian codex must be placed not later than A.D. 70". "Early Christian Book-Production: Papyri and Manuscripts", *The Cambridge History of the Bible* II, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Cambridge, 1969), p. 71.

¹ The codex is, of course, not indispensable in arriving at the concept of canonical writings; the Jews regarded a considerable number of writings as canonical apart from the stimulus of the codex. The use of the codex, however, might well expedite the recognition of a special group of writings as canonical.

² B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the NT* (London, 1964), p. 6.

pointing not to a single corpus, but rather simply to the circulation (and copying) of the individual epistles?

It is clear that the *terminus a quo* for the circulation of Paul's epistles must be located not after the death of Paul, but during his life—very probably immediately after the writing of the first few epistles. This is evident from the fact that Paul himself commands the exchange of epistles between the Colossians and Laodiceans (Col. 4.16); he also addresses the Galatian epistle “to the churches of Galatia” (Gal. 1.2; cf. 2 Cor. 1.1) and urges that 1 Thessalonians be read “to all the brethren” (1 Thes. 5.27).¹ Furthermore, Ephesians seems to be written with a blank space for the addressees,² Romans seems to have circulated in several different recensions, each with an ending appropriate to the destination,³ and 1 Corinthians possesses an ecumenical address *σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ* (1 Cor. 1.2). Whether or not Paul himself simultaneously issued several copies of the same letter(s) to different churches and added the universal salutation to 1 Corinthians, there is every reason to believe that he would have favoured such activities, and we have here evidence of the early circulation of the epistles.

The earliest definite *terminus ad quem* for the collected Pauline epistles is fixed by Marcion's *Apostolikon* (c. 144) which consisted, according to Tertullian,⁴ of ten epistles, in order: Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. However, despite the claims of some writers,⁵ Marcion does not appear to have been the first to collect the epistles of Paul. The abundant use of the latter in the Apostolic Fathers suggests that the first collection may have existed much earlier than AD 144. One of the most difficult problems concerning the formation of the *Corpus Paulinum* is determining what happened in this period between the writing of the epistles and their appearance in the canon of Marcion.

¹ We may add references to other churches which doubtless stimulated interest in them, e.g. 1 Cor. 16.1; 2 Cor. 8.1.

² See W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the NT*, p. 248ff.

³ See F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, Tyndale Commentaries (London, 1963), p. 25ff.

⁴ *Adv. Marc.* V; cf. Epiphanius, *Panarion Haer.* 42. The latter, however, puts Philemon before Philippians. See J. Knox, *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul*, p. 43f.

⁵ E.g. W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie 10 (Tübingen, 1934), p. 224.

There can be little doubt about the chance accumulation of Paul's letters in important church centres from the very beginning, but in addition to this gradual growth of small, partial collections, can we also allege at some point an intentional endeavour to make a complete collection of the letters? One of the chief proponents of such an early collection was E. J. Goodspeed. Goodspeed regarded the publication of Luke-Acts as the stimulus for the original collection, arguing that books written before this event (i.e. Mark, Matthew, Luke-Acts itself) show no influence of Paul's epistles, while those written afterwards (i.e. Revelation, Hebrews, 1 Clement, 1 Peter, Ignatius, Polycarp, John, James, Pastorals, 2 Peter) all reveal knowledge of and dependence upon the Pauline Corpus and in their epistolary character reflect the influence of Paul's letters. According to Goodspeed, Paul's letters, addressed as they were to particular situations then current, soon fell into oblivion in the archives of the recipient churches.¹ Only with the publication of Acts was interest in, and admiration for, Paul revived, thereby providing the impetus for a collection of the Apostle's letters. Since Goodspeed dates Luke-Acts about AD 90, and Clement's epistle may be confidently dated about 95, it is during this period that the Corpus came into existence.²

Finding that the Epistle to the Ephesians apparently made use of the other nine Pauline epistles, Goodspeed extended his hypothesis by contending that Ephesians was written by the collector of the Corpus as an introductory compendium of Pauline theology.³ In support of this contention, he pointed to the textual evidence that Ephesians was an encyclical letter, the non-Pauline characteristics of the epistle, its dependence upon all of the letters of the Corpus, and its place in the Corpus from the beginning (as witnessed, for example, by the use of the epistle in Clement of Rome).⁴

Goodspeed further suggested that the Corpus was first assembled in Asia, very probably in Ephesus itself. A Roman or Corinthian collector, using Acts as his guide, would never have been led to Colossae or

¹ *New Solutions of NT Problems*, pp. 1-10; *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Chicago, 1937), pp. 210-221.

² Cf. C. L. Mitton, *The Formation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters* (London, 1955). Mitton follows Goodspeed closely and dates the Corpus between 85 and 95 AD.

³ *The Meaning of Ephesians* (Chicago, 1933); "Ephesians and the First Edition of Paul", *JBL* 70 (1951), 285-291.

⁴ *New Solutions of NT Problems*, pp. 11-20.

Laodicea¹ in search of letters written by Paul, since Acts does not mention the missionary work of Paul in either city. However, a person beginning with the Colossian and Philemon epistles would have been led by the information provided in Acts to the five other churches for which we now have epistles in the Pauline Corpus.² Moreover, the fact that the author of Ephesians makes such great use of Colossians indicates his long-term familiarity with that epistle and suggests that if he was the collector of the Corpus, Colossians (and Philemon) may have been his starting point. Reckoning Philemon as a letter to the church (cf. Phm. 2) at Laodicea, Goodspeed concluded that the original Corpus consisted of ten epistles: nine epistles to seven churches, and one general epistle, a covering letter written by the collector of the nine.³

The appearance of the Pauline Corpus, Goodspeed alleges, acted as a stimulus in a twofold sense, creating a new interest in the epistolary form as a medium for Christian instruction, and prompting the formation of other collections of writings.⁴ This is said to explain the literary form of the other NT writings and the Apostolic Fathers, as well as account for the letters to seven churches with which the Apocalypse begins and, among others, the Ignatian Corpus of seven letters.⁵

Goodspeed's is an attractive and skillfully framed hypothesis, but much of it is based on surmise rather than fact. In his own popular style, he tends to overstate the arguments which support his hypothesis, and many of his disciples, while accepting the broad outline of the hypothesis, have modified it in certain details. For our own purposes, some of these criticisms may be underlined.

To begin with, Goodspeed, in stressing the occasionality of Paul's letters, goes too far in disallowing their early circulation.⁶ L. Mowry

¹ Goodspeed contends that the letter to the Laodiceans mentioned in Col. 4.16 is none other than that known to us as the Epistle to Philemon. *An Introduction to the NT*, pp. 109-124.

² *Ibid.*, p. 216f.

³ *New Solutions of NT Problems*, pp. 50-64.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 29-49.

⁵ Cf. "Ephesians and the First Edition of Paul", p. 287f. Goodspeed points out the further similarity in the presence of an "introductory" letter before the seven letters in Revelation and the possible use of Polycarp's letter as an introduction to the Ignatian Corpus.

⁶ "In the first place, we must clear our minds of the instinctive notion that from the time of their composition Paul's letters circulated freely and generally among the churches". *New Solutions of NT Problems*, p. 2.

finds it difficult to believe that the practical value of Paul's epistles was not immediately recognized, and that they did not circulate, at least regionally, from the very beginning.¹ Thus according to Mowry there early arose smaller collections in Asia, Macedonia, and Achaëa which were not necessarily known to the author of Acts, and which were eventually brought into one corpus by Goodspeed's collector. Although this hypothesis also falls short of demonstration, it seems a more likely explanation of the situation in the later decades of the first century. If there is any truth in Mowry's argument, then Goodspeed has made too much of the publication of Acts in claiming it as the *de facto* cause of the collection of Paul's letters. J. Knox was also convinced that Goodspeed had exaggerated the importance of the publication of Acts, the more so since he was persuaded of a mid-century date for Acts, a date long after the emergence of the published corpus.² A further obstacle to the place of Acts in Goodspeed's hypothesis is the fact that Paul's activity as a letter-writer is nowhere mentioned in Acts.³ We can with Goodspeed allow that the publication of Luke-Acts intensified interest in the great Apostle and perhaps influenced a formal collection of his writings, but not that it caused the first, novel collection of hitherto neglected and forgotten epistles.

When we have once allowed the chance accumulation of certain of Paul's letters in various church centres, it becomes possible to explain early acquaintance with these letters on the basis of partial collections, entirely apart from the initial formation of the corpus. K. Lake has pointed to early textual variations and the variety encountered in the order of the epistles (e.g. as in Marcion, the Muratorian Fragment, Tertullian and Origen) as evidence of the gradual formation of the Pauline Corpus through the various collections to be found in different sectors of the Church.⁴ Streeter also favours a gradual process in the

¹ "The Early Circulation of Paul's Letters", *JBL* 63 (1944), 73-86. Mowry rightly stresses the value of the epistles for instruction in Christian living and the consequent demand for them in the various churches. J. Knox also slightly softens Goodspeed's dictum. *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul*, p. 35f. Cf. Zahn, *GNTK*, I, 162.

² "I believe that a more adequate motive for the collection and publication of Paul's letters can be found in the continuing loyalty of certain communities to Paul ... and that the publication of Luke-Acts is too purely 'literary' an event to serve as the occasion, much less the cause, of the publication of the letters". *Marcion and the NT* (Chicago, 1942), p. 173.

³ See C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament* (New York, 1962), p. 204.

⁴ *The Earlier Epistles of Paul* (London, 1927), p. 358. A later work however speaks of an "original corpus" but pleads ignorance concerning the date, place, and creator of the collection. K. and S. Lake, *An Introduction to the NT* (London, 1938), p. 96ff.

formation of the Corpus, and speaks of four stages in its growth, the first of which he refers to as the "nucleus" of the corpus (Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians and perhaps Philemon) found already in Clement of Rome.¹ A similar view is held by P. N. Harrison, who refers to a step by step process and a variety of collections in different places.²

At the other end of the spectrum, Harnack has stressed that no single Pauline letter is known to us via a tradition independent of the total corpus, and that in reality we know nothing of smaller, partial collections.³ The first collection made was a complete collection and, accordingly, evidence of a knowledge of several epistles can be taken as knowledge of the total corpus. Harnack thus acknowledges as early as Polycarp the widespread existence of a Pauline Corpus of thirteen epistles, including the Pastorals, and prior to this a corpus of ten, dating from the last quarter of the first century.⁴

Zahn allows that very early "private" collections existed in different regions of the Church, but at the same time argues that the evidence of the Apostolic Fathers points to the early circulation of a common Corpus of thirteen epistles.⁵ Since this collection replaced earlier ones, Zahn argues that its date must be early—before other collections became firm. The date of the original collection is put before the writing of Clement's epistle and after the writing of Acts, suggesting a middle date of approximately 80-85 according to Zahn.⁶

While Zahn differs from Harnack in allowing the existence of partial collections from the beginning, both writers anticipate Goodspeed's contention that the Pauline Corpus had already come into existence by the end of the first century. The evidence is drawn mainly from the Apostolic Fathers. Ignatius refers to the epistles of Paul when he writes to the Ephesians that Paul ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν

¹ *The Four Gospels*, p. 526ff. The three later stages listed by Streeter are the Ten Epistles (Marcion, c. 140), the Thirteen (Muratorian Canon, before 200), and the Fourteen (including Hebrews, c. 350).

² *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*, p. 235ff. Harrison, however, also speaks of a Corpus of ten epistles reaching Smyrna "long before AD 135". *Ibid.*, p. 295.

³ *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus* (Leipzig, 1926), p. 6. The exchange of letters between the Laodicean and Colossian churches is said to be a special instance involving two closely related sister-churches.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁵ *Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 35f.

⁶ *GNTK I*, 835.

Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (*Eph.* 12.2).¹ Polycarp too refers to Paul's letter-writing activity, ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς (*Phil.* 3.2).² Clement similarly makes mention of Paul's correspondence with the Corinthians, ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου (47.1). To these references may be added 2 Pet. 3.15, Παῦλος κατὰ τὴν δοθείσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν ... ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, although the significance of the words for the existence of the corpus remains hidden due to the uncertainty of their date.³ More indirect evidence may well be found in Polycarp's reference (*Phil.* 13.2) to the letters of Ignatius requested by the Philippian. Very probably the idea and desirability of such a collection was suggested by the Pauline Corpus.

More important, however, than these specific references to epistles of Paul—which in themselves could refer to partial collections—is the the evidence of the knowledge of the epistles available through allusions and quotations. Since the Apostolic Fathers allude to a majority of Paul's epistles, it is more natural to assume that the Pauline Corpus

¹ Some difficulty is caused by this passage since Paul refers either to Ephesus or to Ephesian Christians (besides the Ephesian epistle itself) only in Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and 1 and 2 Timothy. The translation "in the whole of his epistle" (i.e. Ephesians) is improbable. The statement is best understood as a hyperbole. Cf. Lightfoot II, 2, 65; and Bauer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, HZNT II (Tübingen, 1920), 212. Grant allows both possibilities, but in his translation prints "in a whole letter". *Ignatius of Antioch*, AF IV, 43. Goodspeed says that every letter reminded the reader that the Ephesians were responsible for the collection! *An Introduction to the NT*, p. 219.

² Since it is improbable that Paul wrote more than one epistle to the Philippian, the plural ἐπιστολάς is either to be understood as designating a single epistle (thus Lightfoot II, 3, 327) or as a mistaken inference of Polycarp based on Phil. 3.1 (thus Bauer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, HZNT II, 287). Both commentators disparage the contention that Polycarp may be referring to a regional collection containing 1 and 2 Thessalonians. A further reference to Paul's epistle(s) is perhaps to be seen in Poly. *Phil.* 11.3 where, however, the text is available only in Latin translation and the meaning ambiguous. See Lightfoot II, 3, 342 and Bauer II, 295. Schoedel is probably right when he writes that "It seems more likely that we have here no more than an imprecision arising from familiarity with Pauline phraseology" (cf. 2 Cor. 10.1, 11; Phil. 1.27). *Polycarp, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Fragments of Papias*, AF V, 15.

³ The meaning given to *πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς* often depends on the date assigned to 2 Peter. Zahn, holding an early date, understands the phrase to refer only to a small private collection known to the author. *Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, p. 36; cf. *GNTK* I, 835. The majority of commentators, however, dating the epistle well into the second century understand the phrase as a reference to the entire Pauline Corpus. Cf. E. Flesseman-van Leer, "Prinzipien der Sammlung und Ausscheidung bei der Bildung des Kanons", *ZTK* 61 (1964), p. 406, n. 6.

was in circulation than that such large collections had spontaneously come into existence in their respective localities. Moreover, as Zahn has correctly indicated,¹ the Apostolic Fathers often seem by their allusions to presuppose an acquaintance with epistles which would be contained only unexpectedly (if at all) in the regional collection of the addressees. When we are thus confronted in an early Apostolic Father with a knowledge of the majority of the epistles, which originally had been addressed to different geographical regions, it becomes most probable that a Pauline Corpus is being used. Here the argument from silence becomes especially perilous: it does not follow that because one or two particular epistles are not alluded to, they were unknown to the author.² Rather, the use of a substantial number of epistles suggests possession of the entire Corpus.

Accordingly, on the basis of the considerable number of allusions in Ignatius and Polycarp there is widespread agreement that the Pauline Corpus was available to them.³ At the same time, there is a curious reluctance on the part of some to allow similar use of the Corpus by Clement of Rome. Zahn, together with Goodspeed and his followers, has no difficulty with the admission; Harnack⁴ and Sanday,⁵ however, are somewhat hesitant. Harrison⁶ and Zuntz⁷ definitely rule out the

¹ *GNTK* I, 830f.

² It is well to note with C. R. Gregory that none of these ancient authors wrote with our peculiar interests in mind, nor felt the obligation to allude to every writing they knew in every epistle they wrote. *Canon and Text of the NT* (Edinburgh, 1907), p. 60f.

³ A notable exception is W. Bauer who allows only isolated small collections prior to the first methodical collection of Marcion. *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, p. 224.

⁴ In his monograph, Harnack, after citing the evidence of Polycarp and Ignatius, adds "Dass Clemens von Rom diese Sammlung gekannt hat, lässt sich nicht erweisen". *Die Briefsammlung*, p. 72, n. 4. Earlier he had written of Clement "In den Händen den Verfassers unseres Briefs befand sich bereits eine Sammlung paulinischer Briefe". *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* I, 253. Cf. *The Origin of the NT*, trans. J. R. Wilkinson (London, 1925), p. 27, n. 2. But in the former work he says we know nothing of partial collections (p. 6). One therefore does not know how to reconcile the two statements. If we cannot "prove" Clement's knowledge of the Corpus, neither can we "prove" that of Ignatius or Polycarp.

⁵ Sanday writes that the argument "seems to me of doubtful cogency". *Inspiration*, p. 365.

⁶ Harrison boldly says "It is impossible to extract from his Epistle any demonstration that he possessed a Corpus Paulinum including all or even most of our ten". *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*, p. 299. Harrison also denies that Ignatius knew the Corpus, alleging that Polycarp is the first witness to it, perhaps having a hand in its formation c. 135.

⁷ For Zuntz it is unlikely that Clement knew the Corpus since he "refers to Romans

use of a Corpus by Clement, alleging that his knowledge of the letters of Paul is minimal, being limited to one or two of them. According to our study, however, Clement evidences a probable knowledge of a majority of the Pauline epistles and insofar as this can be taken as an indicator of a knowledge of the Corpus, Clement certainly ranks with Ignatius, and very nearly with Polycarp.¹ The conclusion we are led to is that there is no justifiable reason for distinguishing Clement's use of the epistles from that of Ignatius and Polycarp. If the latter indicate a knowledge of the Corpus, the same can be said of Clement.

Thus without denying the existence and growth of partial collections from the beginning, it seems highly probable that the Apostolic Fathers, including Clement, knew and made use of a particular collection, the Pauline Corpus, and that we must therefore put the date of its compilation prior to AD 95. But what can be said concerning the contents of this collection? It is universally admitted that the Corpus was not exhaustive in the sense of containing everything Paul ever wrote. Some other letters known to us indirectly² were presumably either lost or purposefully omitted from the Corpus.³ That the collection consisted at least of the ten epistles in Marcion's *Apostolikon* seems clear. Zahn pointed out that, in contrast to the catholic epistles, neither before nor after Marcion is there any evidence of a dispute concerning any of the ten Pauline epistles.⁴ At the same time, some writers, convinced that the Pauline Corpus provided the model for the sevenfold corpus of the beginning of the Apocalypse and of the epistles of Ignatius, have felt themselves compelled to find an original sevenfold Pauline Corpus. W. Schmithals maintains that the original Corpus consisted only of the seven *Hauptbriefe*, and that Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon, belonging together, were added at a later date.⁵ This smaller collection,

and 1 Corinthians (and Hebrews) but not to the other Epistles". *The Text of the Epistles*, p. 14. Yet a few sentences later he allows that Clement may have known Galatians and Ephesians.

¹ See above, p. 283ff.

² Cf. 1 Cor. 5.11; 2 Cor. 7.8; Col. 4.16.

³ Harnack was of the opinion that only those letters which were valuable for instruction and edification were chosen by the collector. *Die Briefsammlung*, p. 10.

⁴ *GNTK* I, 831.

⁵ "Zur Abfassung und ältesten Sammlung der paulinischen Hauptbriefe", *ZNTW* 51 (1960), 225-245. The order of the epistles in this collection was 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Romans, according to Schmithals, who points to the edited beginning of 1 Corinthians and conclusion of Romans.

used by Clement,¹ is of an early date and was collected in Corinth, not to provide a complete collection, but solely for purposes of countering Gnosticism. This brilliant conjecture of Schmithals, however, not only lacks substantiation in that there is no evidence that this smaller collection ever existed, but also totally ignores that Clement shows a knowledge of Ephesians and possibly Colossians as well. K. L. Carroll also stresses the sevenfold character of the original Corpus, but instead of excluding epistles, finds it by alleging that 1 and 2 Corinthians were originally one epistle as were the two Thessalonian epistles.² Then, with Goodspeed, regarding Philemon as originally "to the Laodiceans" and Ephesians as an introductory epistle, he has a seven letter Corpus together with its covering letter. Carroll's argument about the unity of 1 and 2 Corinthians is based on the singular *ἐπιστολήν* in Cl. 47.1, *ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολήν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου*.³ This, however, infers too much from the *ἐπιστολήν*, which as Lightfoot has shown can with no difficulty refer to both epistles.⁴

These writers are all constrained to see a sevenfold aspect to the Pauline Corpus because of their belief that the latter served as a model for other sevenfold corpora, but also because of the possible significance of number symbolism—"seven" being the number of perfection or completion. It is quite probable that Paul's having written to seven churches was regarded as significant in some such way. But to take this to mean that the original Corpus necessarily consisted of only seven epistles is to go further than the evidence warrants. Goodspeed is more correct in allowing nine epistles to seven churches. Indeed, going beyond Goodspeed, there seems no reason to prohibit an original Pauline Corpus of nine letters to seven churches (including Ephesians as one of the seven) and at least one personal letter (Philemon), making a total of ten, the presence of the latter thereby facilitating the later addition of the Pastorals. In any event, it seems wise to

¹ "Da schon der 1 Clem diese—die älteste—Sammlung von Paulus-Briefen benutzt, muss sie spätestens in der 80er Jahren des 1. Jh.s entstanden und also älter als die Apokalypse sein". *Ibid.*, p. 242.

² "The Expansion of the Pauline Corpus", *JBL* 72 (1953), 230-237. Carroll conjectures that Tatian first divided the epistles and expanded the Pauline Corpus.

³ "Had the Corinthian correspondence then existed as two letters it is exceedingly likely that Clement would have said 'Take up the *first* letter of the blessed Paul', for it is to the first chapter of 1 Corinthians that he is referring". *Ibid.*, p. 230. Carroll also points to the fact that Marcion wrote only one prologue for the Corinthian and one for the Thessalonian epistles.

⁴ See above, p. 209. Carroll fails to reckon with Lightfoot's argument.

exercise caution in the inferences made on the basis of number symbolism.¹

It is, of course, possible that Clement's collection of Pauline epistles was only a partial one and that his use of certain of the epistles and his explicit reference to "the epistle" of Paul (47.1) acted as a stimulus for the first methodical collection of the epistles either at Corinth or elsewhere. But without further information, this suggestion, like Goodspeed's suggestion of Acts as the stimulus of the collection, remains only an interesting conjecture. However, against this suggestion is the fact that there is no appreciable difference between Clement, on the one hand, and Ignatius and Polycarp, on the other hand, in the use of Pauline epistles (or in the number used). If it be concluded that Ignatius and Polycarp knew the entire (ten epistle) Corpus, there is no reason for denying that Clement may also have known the Corpus.

Perhaps the most difficult question relating to the contents of the original Pauline Corpus is that of the Pastoral epistles. Since Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp all witness to a probable knowledge of the Pastorals, it is possible that the latter were a part of the original collection, and that the Pauline Corpus known to them consisted of thirteen rather than ten epistles. This in fact was the view propounded by Zahn who admitted a knowledge of the Pastorals in both Ignatius and Clement.² Harnack somewhat more conservatively suggested that the Pastorals had been added to the original Corpus of ten by the time of Polycarp.³

In addition to the opinion of many that the Pastorals are second century pseudepigrapha, two obstacles stand in the way of this view. The first and most important of these is the fact that the Pastorals are not found in Marcion's *Apostolikon*. This means that if the Pastorals were already a part of the Pauline Corpus at the beginning of the century, then Marcion purposefully deleted them from his canon. Since this is in line with Marcion's rejection of other NT writings, it is far from being an impossible explanation.⁴ Another possible explanation of the omission is that a ten epistle Corpus, omitting the personal epistles (but

¹ Both Carroll and Schmithals seem to overemphasize the importance of number mysticism. They find significance not only in the number "seven" but also in "thirteen", signifying the "love of unity" (Carroll, *op. cit.*, p. 235). Schmithals finds significance in the later addition of Hebrews, bringing the total to 2×7 epistles.

² *GNTK I*, 827f.

³ *Die Briefsammlung*, pp. 6, 14.

⁴ Tertullian explained the omission of the Pastorals in this way. *Adv. Marc V*, 21.

including Philemon as a church epistle), remained in circulation along with the thirteen epistle Corpus. It is difficult, however, to accept Harnack's supposition that Marcion was ignorant of the Pastorals.¹ Since Marcion would hardly have found these epistles amenable to his own system of belief,² there is no reason to doubt that he would have chosen a ten epistle Corpus in preference to a Corpus including the Pastorals or, knowing the larger Corpus only, have rejected the Pastorals as unsatisfactory. The second obstacle to an early thirteen epistle Corpus is the absence of the Pastorals from P⁴⁶, our earliest MS of the Pauline Corpus, dating from the early third century. The codex, however, is incomplete, and although it does not look as though the original contained enough leaves to include the Pastorals, this is not impossible.³ We may have here evidence for the existence of the ten epistle Corpus alongside a thirteen epistle Corpus, but it is questionable to what degree P⁴⁶ may be regarded as normative for deciding the original contents of the Pauline Corpus. Thus while these obstacles suggest a due amount of caution, they are not insuperable.

The probable use of the Pastoral epistles by Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp suggests that their Corpus could possibly have included thirteen epistles.⁴ It is difficult to know how, apart from their inclusion

¹ Cf. *Die Briefsammlung*, p. 6. Goodspeed rightly remarks that if the Pastorals were known to Polycarp it is inconceivable that Marcion did not know of their existence. *New Solutions of NT Problems*, p. 59. Bauer also finds it difficult to believe that Marcion knew the Pastorals, but then he denies that Polycarp knew them. The similarities between the Pastorals and both Clement and Polycarp are explained by "einen gewissen gemein-kirchlichen Sprachgebrauch". *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, p. 225f.

² Indeed, so contrary are the Pastorals to Marcion's position that some writers have alleged that they were written for the specific purpose of refuting Marcion. See e.g. Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the NT*, p. 336ff. Cf. D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction: The Pauline Epistles* (London, 1963), p. 200f. Marcion could, of course, have edited the Pastorals so as to omit the objectionable passages and thus have retained them in his canon. Guthrie wonders whether Marcion would have considered the end-product worth the trouble. *Ibid.*

³ See Guthrie, *ibid.*, p. 201f. F. G. Kenyon, however, thinks it more probable that the extra leaves were left blank. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, Fasciculus III Supplement (London, 1936), p. xf.

⁴ It is argued by some, of course, that the literary contacts which exist between the Pastorals and Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp are to be explained by the dependence of the former upon the latter. What is not noticed by the proponents of this argument is that the author of the Pastorals must thereby have possessed a corpus of the Apostolic Fathers! It is true that the Ignatian epistles were collected early, but it is most unlikely

in the Corpus, these personal epistles could otherwise have early achieved such wide circulation. We cannot tell, however, whether the thirteen epistles were included in the Corpus from the very beginning or not. If the Pastorals were added to an original Corpus of ten epistles, this must have occurred very early. The advantage of this latter hypothesis is that it may account for the simultaneous circulation of a Corpus of ten and a Corpus of thirteen epistles, thereby solving the puzzle created by Marcion and P⁴⁶.

One of the most notable things about P⁴⁶ is that it includes Hebrews among the Pauline epistles. The question might be raised whether, since Clement so clearly knew Hebrews, it may not be that Hebrews was in his Pauline Corpus. It has in fact recently been argued by C. P. Anderson that Hebrews was a part of the Corpus from the beginning.¹ Anderson points to the use of Hebrews by Clement, its presence in P⁴⁶, the statement of Origen that it has long been handed down as Pauline, and the difficulty of adding an epistle to a Corpus already formed. Concerning Clement's use of Hebrews, Anderson comes to the unwarranted conclusion that since Clement made no distinction between 1 Corinthians, Romans and Hebrews he believed all three to be Pauline.² This is plainly a *non sequitur*. To be sure, Clement does not distinguish between his sources (apart from 1 Corinthians) but he is not at all thereby restricted to Pauline sources. Moreover, however difficult it may be to add an epistle to a Corpus (which seems to have happened in the case of the Pastorals), it is more difficult to exclude an epistle which has had a place in the Corpus from the beginning. Marcion might have excluded Hebrews from his *Apostolikon* as Anderson conjectures, yet the orthodox churches would as little have followed him here as they did in his other excisions. Anderson's argument that Hebrews was in the original Pauline Corpus cannot stand. It is virtually impossible in view of the almost total silence concerning the epistle in the

that the author of the Pastorals knew *all* of these sub-apostolic writings, let alone borrowed from them in the same way that he did the Pauline epistles.

¹ "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline Letter Collection", *HTR* 59 (1966), 429-438.

² He justifies this conclusion by saying "Otherwise, we have to suppose that he had access to some of Paul's letters—Romans, 1 Corinthians, and perhaps several others—and also to Hebrews as an independent document *known not to be Pauline*, and still chose to make use of the latter in the closest association with authentic Pauline letters". *Ibid.*, p. 435. Anderson ignores Clement's use of other apostolic sources, such as 1 Peter and James.

second century, as well as the subsequent debate concerning its authorship.

The question of the order of the epistles in the original Corpus has been much discussed not only as a problem in itself, but also because of its possible importance in determining the place of the original collection. The evidence which has come down to us concerning the order of the epistles is perplexing. The following are the earliest lists.

<i>Marcion</i> ¹	<i>Muratorian Fragment</i>	<i>Tertullian</i> ²	<i>P46</i>
Gal.	1 and 2 Cor.	1 and 2 Cor.	Rom.
1 and 2 Cor.	Eph.	Gal.	Heb.
Rom.	Phil.	Phil.	1 and 2 Cor.
1 and 2 Thes.	Col.	1 and 2 Thes.	Eph.
Laod. (= Eph.)	Gal.	Eph.	Gal.
Col.	1 and 2 Thes.	Rom.	Phil.
Phil.	Rom.		Col.
Phm.	Phm.		1 Thes.
	Tit.		(2 Thes. and Phm.) ³
	1 and 2 Tim.		

Goodspeed argued, as we have seen, that Ephesians stood at the head of the Corpus, having been written as an introductory cyclical for it, and at the same time thereby indicating the region of Ephesus as its place of origin. Knox assisted Goodspeed's hypothesis by conjecturing that because of his predilection for Galatians, Marcion substituted Galatians for Ephesians as the opening epistle of the Corpus and inserted the latter (which he called "Laodiceans") into the place originally occupied by Galatians. Working with the stichometry of the epistles, Knox saw that if the positions of Galatians and Ephesians were interchanged, the epistles in Marcion's list—apart from the introductory Ephesians itself—would be arranged according to length.⁴ But if Galatians originally stood first it became difficult to account for the place of Ephesians *after* the Thessalonian epistles, since the stichometry suggests that the longer Ephesians belongs before them.

¹ The list of Marcion's *Apostolikon* is derived from Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* V. It is substantiated by Epiphanius, who however inverts the last two epistles, concluding with Philipians. *Adv. Haer. (Marc.)*, ixff.

² *Adv. Marc.* IV, 5. Colossians and Philemon were unquestionably a part of Tertullian's Corpus, but their place in the order cannot be determined.

³ The MS breaks early in 1 Thessalonians, but certainly included 2 Thessalonians and Philemon, if not the Pastorals.

⁴ *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul*, p. 41ff. The Corinthian Epistles are reckoned as one, as are the Thessalonian Epistles.

The basic weakness of this clever argument by Goodspeed and Knox is that no tangible evidence has thus far been produced showing Ephesians at the head of a list of Pauline epistles. This has been pointed out, among others, by C. H. Buck, Jr.¹ However, beginning with the unfortunate assumption that the codex did not come into use until the end of the second century, Buck argued that Marcion's order was to be explained by doctrinal motivations together with the limitations imposed by the necessary use of two rolls. For prior to the beginning of the third century, according to Buck, the arrangement of the order of epistles by decreasing length was not practiced.² Fatal to this contention, however, is the fact that apart from Galatians the order of Marcion's list is clearly based on length (despite the slightly anomalous position of Ephesians). J. Finegan is much more correct when he asserts the use of the codex from the very beginning of the Pauline Corpus and suggests that it would have been most natural from the beginning to order the epistles according to length.³ He also has presented a more convincing explanation of certain lesser variations in the order of the epistles by indicating the variability which can occur in measuring stichometry.⁴ As for the lists of Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* IV, 5) and the Muratorian Fragment (which, ending in Romans, are obviously not arranged by length), Finegan suggested that they were better witnesses to the books received in the Corpus rather than the actual order found in any edition of the Corpus.⁵

Besides Ephesians, two other epistles which evidence an ecumenical address, 1 Corinthians and Romans, have been put forward as first epistles of the original collection and as possibly indicating the place of the first collection. From the lists known to us, both of these epistles

¹ "The Early Order of the Pauline Corpus", *JBL* 68 (1949), 351-357.

² Cf. Goodspeed's correction of Buck at this point. "Ephesians and the First Edition of Paul", p. 290f. Buck, however, was simply following the arguments of Knox, who while noting that the codex replaced the roll "no doubt earlier than has sometimes been thought", nevertheless proceeded with his two-roll hypothesis concerning the original Corpus. *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul*, p. 42.

³ "The Original Form of the Pauline Collection", *HTR* 49 (1956), 85-103. "Every probability speaks for the conclusion that Paul's collected letters were published originally in a codex rather than a roll" p. 88.

⁴ Finegan concludes it probable "that the order of the epistles in the Pauline collection was determined by their respective lengths, and that variations in the determinations of those lengths accounts for the variations in order which appear". *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 91. This suggestion, however, is not altogether satisfactory. See Zahn, *GNTK* II, 344ff.

have at some time headed the collection. Since the Pauline Corpus first makes its appearance in Clement's epistle written from Rome, may not Rome have been where the collection originated, as is perhaps suggested by the order in P⁴⁶ and later MSS? It does not follow, however, that because our first knowledge of the collected epistles happens to be from Rome, the Corpus first took form there. Moreover, in the earlier lists Romans is not at the head of the Corpus. If Romans had been the first epistle of the Corpus received by Marcion, what motivation would he have had to put Romans after the Corinthian epistles?¹ On the other hand, a later exaltation of Romans to the first position in the Corpus is understandable both because of the intrinsic importance of the epistle and the prominence of Rome itself.

A stronger argument seems possible for the original priority of the Corinthian epistles in the Corpus, as is witnessed by Tertullian, the Muratorian Fragment and, allowing for the intentional displacement of Galatians, Marcion. Harnack also called attention to the inappropriateness of the ecumenical address in such a personal letter as 1 Corinthians suggesting that it was a later interpolation designed to introduce the whole Corpus. Further, according to Harnack, it is most probably in Corinth that the composite letter known to us as 2 Corinthians came into existence and was included in the Corpus.² Zahn also argues that Corinth was where the Corpus originated, suggesting that Clement provides evidence favouring this view. In 47.1 Clement writes ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου · τὴν πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; For Zahn, the πρῶτον indicates that Clement believed 1 Corinthians to be the first epistle written by Paul and is evidence that 1 Corinthians stood at the beginning of his Corpus.³ Moreover, since Clement assumes that in Corinth, as in Rome, 1 Corinthians stands at the head of the Corpus, Zahn says that he must have had reason to believe that the order was

¹ Cf. Zahn, *GNTK* II, 347; W. Schmithals, *op. cit.*, p. 239.

² *Die Briefsammlung*, p. 9. Harnack indicates that Windisch lately convinced him of the composite character of 2 Corinthians, against which he had long argued.

³ *GNTK* I, 813. "Clemens glaubt zu wissen, dass der 1. Korintherbrief unseres NT's der älteste Gemeindebrief des Paulus sei". Clement therefore made the same mistake as the author of the Muratorian Fragment in assuming that since 1 Corinthians was the first epistle in the Corpus it was also the oldest. Zahn, indeed, goes so far as to assert that the order of Clement's Corpus was identical with that of the Fragment, beginning with 1 Corinthians and ending with Romans (Zahn's *Ordnung* I). Cf. *Ibid.*, II, 346. Cf. *Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, p. 36.

the same in the whole of Christendom.¹ Knopf follows Zahn in his interpretation of *πρῶτον*, adding that *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* might then be understood as the preaching of Paul embodied in the collection of his letters.² Attractive as these suggestions are, they rest too much on what is at best a doubtful interpretation of *πρῶτον*. Lacking more specific definition, the more natural interpretation of *πρῶτον*, if it refers to position, is that it refers to the beginning of 1 Corinthians or the combined 1 and 2 Corinthians rather than to the beginning of the Pauline Corpus.³ The phrase *ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* is perhaps best understood temporally as referring to the period of Paul's missionary activity (cf. Phil. 4.15).⁴ Consequently, the arguments of Zahn and Knopf of necessity remain highly conjectural.⁵

It has generally been assumed that the first epistle of the original Pauline Corpus would have been given an ecumenical address to underline the catholicity of the Corpus. This very premise, upon which the claims of 1 Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians largely depend, has recently been attacked by N. A. Dahl.⁶ According to Dahl the catholicity of the individual epistles would have been self-authenticating by their actual inclusion in the Corpus.⁷ The ecumenical addresses of 1 Corinthians, Romans and Ephesians, rather than being evidence of their initial position in the Corpus, suggest that each of the three enjoyed wide circulation independent of and prior to the formation

¹ *GNTK* I, 832.

² *Die Apostolischen Väter*, HZNT I, 123. Knopf notes that this interpretation of *εὐαγγελίου* is by no means necessary to Zahn's argument concerning *πρῶτον*.

³ Thus Lightfoot I, 2, 143. Grant alternatively takes it to be a temporal reference, equivalent to the following *ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*. *AF* II, 78. That there may have existed confusion very early concerning the meaning of *πρῶτον* is possibly suggested by the Greek underlying the Latin MS which apparently read *τίνα τρόπον* for *τί πρῶτον*. Can the change have been intentional in view of a more accurate chronology or the new position of Romans at the head of the Pauline Corpus?

⁴ Campenhausen regards the phrase as referring to 1 Corinthians. *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel* (Tübingen, 1968), p. 170.

⁵ Cf. the words of Sanders, "il est peu probable que, dans ses mots, Clément ait caché des nuances subtiles, destinées à être découvertes par les futurs historiens du canon". *L'Hellénisme de Saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme*, p. 155. n. 1.

⁶ "The Particularity of the Pauline Epistles as a Problem in the Ancient Church", *Neotestamentica et Patristica* (Cullmann Festschrift), Suppl. Nov. Test. VI (Leiden, 1962), pp. 261-271.

⁷ "In order to show that Paul was speaking to all churches, when he wrote to one, it would neither be necessary nor sufficient to give the first letter in the collection a general address". *Ibid.*, p. 270.

of the Corpus. This too, however, remains a possibility which cannot be substantiated, but is still valuable in warning against too hasty a conclusion based solely on the presence of an ecumenical address.¹

It is evident, then, that we cannot confidently determine either the order of the original Corpus (not even the precise contents, it would seem) or the place where it was first published. Still less can we determine the actual collector, despite such brilliant suggestions as Onesimus, Luke, or Timothy. The evidence which is available is slight and indirect, allowing a confusing variety of interpretations, and thus giving rise to numerous hypotheses which cannot advance beyond the status of conjecture.

However, in the light of Clement's knowledge of Pauline epistles, this much can be said to be probable. Clement, like Ignatius and Polycarp, knew a Pauline Corpus consisting at least of ten epistles, and possibly of thirteen epistles. This Corpus probably came into existence about AD 90, if not before, and was widely circulated, quite possibly in codex form.² We cannot with any degree of certainty say what the order of the epistles in this Corpus was, but not improbably they were arranged according to length. Where and when the collection took shape, and who its collector was, remains unknown, but it seems clear that he had the benefit of smaller regional collections to aid him in his task.

¹ Caution here is doubly warranted since it is not inconceivable that Paul himself prefixed an ecumenical address to certain epistles. Lietzmann has found Synagogue inscriptions containing universalizing sentiments very similar to Paul's words in 1 Cor. 1.2. Lietzmann's Greek translation of the Jewish formula reveals the similarity: *εἰρήνη ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ τοῦ λαοῦ Ἰσραήλ*. He thus refuses to see the ecumenical address of 1 Corinthians as an interpolation, preferring rather to understand it "als eine in der üblichen Weise des Paulus umgeformte christianisierte Variante der jüdischen Formel". "Zwei Notizen zu Paulus, 1. Der Anfang des ersten Korintherbriefs", in *Kleine Schriften* (ed. K. Aland), TU 68 (Berlin, 1958), p. 284-287. Cf. Grant, *The Formation of the NT*, p. 26.

² C. S. C. Williams, summarizing the evidence for the Apostolic Fathers' knowledge of the Pauline Corpus, justly writes "The argument from silence is precarious and the findings of the Oxford Committee...on the positive evidence were somewhat too cautious". Concerning the Pastoral epistles he adds, "here again the Committee was probably overcautious". Williams seems to allow the existence of a ten epistle (and possibly a thirteen epistle) Corpus as early as AD 90. "The History of the Text and Canon of the New Testament to Jerome", *CHB II* (Cambridge, 1969), p. 44. Cf. R. M. Grant, who refers to Pauline epistles "combined into one collection by the end of the first century". "The New Testament Canon", *CHB I*, 235.

2. *The Gospels*

While it seems difficult to deny that Clement, writing from Rome in AD 95, was acquainted with the Synoptic Gospels, his epistle provides us with little positive indication of this acquaintance. The two places (13.2; 46.8) in which he explicitly quotes sayings of Jesus are, as we have argued, in all likelihood dependent upon oral tradition. There are a few probable allusions to the Synoptics,¹ but no convincing evidence of Clement's knowledge of the Fourth Gospel.

It seems most probable that by the end of the first century the Synoptic Gospels had individually achieved a wide circulation. Yet witness of the Apostolic Fathers to the Synoptics is complicated by the fact that quotations are limited almost exclusively to sayings of Jesus, for which oral tradition provides a ready alternative source. Nonetheless, there are indications that the Apostolic Fathers made use of the Gospels.² Did they perhaps know a fourfold Gospel collection analogous to the collection of Pauline letters with which they were probably familiar?

The origins of such a Gospel collection are even more obscure than the origins of the Pauline Corpus. Not only are the Gospels used less by the Apostolic Fathers, but their contents overlap one another as well as being overlapped themselves by continuing oral tradition. Indirect evidence which might possibly be found in references to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is also difficult, in that the primary meaning of the word as "good news" referring to the preached message may be intended.³

¹ As we have shown above, there seems to be some slight evidence that Clement was familiar with both Matthew and Mark. Since Clement probably knew Acts, he also would have been acquainted with Luke's Gospel. Streeter suggests that "The absence of reminiscences of the Gospel [Luke] in 1 Clement would be explained if its adoption at Rome was comparatively recent so that its phraseology had not yet had time to become part of the texture of Clement's mind". *The Four Gospels*, p. 534.

² This is true to a larger extent than Köster admits (*Synoptische Überlieferung*). For a more realistic estimate see the relevant sections in Grant, *The Formation of the NT*.

³ Köster has examined this subject fully in his excursus "Der Gebrauch des Wortes εὐαγγέλιον in nach-apostolischer Zeit". *Synoptische Überlieferung*, pp. 6-12. The use of the word in the early Apostolic Fathers, as in the NT, is limited to the oral kerygma (Cl. 47. 2; Barn. 8.3; 5.9; Ign. *Phila.* 5.1; 8.2; 9.2; Ign. *Smyrn.* 5.1; 7.2; Did. 8.2; 11.3). In some passages the change to a written "gospel" begins to be apparent (Did. 15.3,4; 2 Cl. 8.5), but it is in Justin Martyr that the word first refers uniquely to the written Gospels (called ἀπομνημονεύματα, *Apol.* 66.3) and is used with the introductory formula γέγραπται (*Dial.* 100.1). While not doubting the truth of this evolution, we may question whether some of the early references, particularly Ign. *Smyrn.* 7.2

The first clear reference to a fourfold Gospel comes from Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* III, 11, 8) about AD 180. How much earlier than this the Gospel collection may have existed is disputed. Perhaps a decade earlier Tatian appears to have used the four Gospels (but possibly also a fifth) in his production of the Diatessaron. At about the middle of the second century Justin Martyr evidences a probable knowledge of the four Gospels.¹ Prior to this the evidence becomes increasingly uncertain.

A number of writers have argued for the origin of the collection in the early decades of the second century.² A basic premise of this hypothesis is that the collection is connected with, if not causally dependent upon, the publication of the Fourth Gospel. Zahn and Crehan thus point to the tradition found in *Acta Timothei* and Eusebius (*HE* III, 24, 7ff.) that John, having become acquainted with the three Synoptics, approved them and wrote his own Gospel to supplement them, thereby producing the fourfold collection. Since this tradition is widespread in the early Church and finds possible indirect confirmation as well,³ it is taken to be true at least in its essentials.⁴ The appearance of the collection is accordingly linked with the Fourth Gospel so that where there is a knowledge of the latter the former may be regarded as also present.⁵ Thus if Ignatius probably knew the Gospel of John,

and Did. 8.2, may not also refer to the written Gospels. See also *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. Lampe. Fasc. 2 (Oxford, 1962), p. 555; G. Friedrich, *TDNT* II, 735.

¹ It has, however, been questioned whether Justin knew the Fourth Gospel. Cf. Knox, *Marcion and the NT*, p. 148.

² E.g., E. J. Goodspeed, *The Formation of the NT* (Chicago, 1926), p. 37f.; *An Introduction to the NT*, p. 313f.; Zahn *GNTK* I, 941-950; Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* I, 589ff.; Harnack, *The Origin of the NT*, pp. 71ff., 82; J. H. Crehan, "The Fourfold Character of the Gospel", *Studia Evangelica* (ed. K. Aland, F. L. Cross, et al.), TU 73 (Berlin, 1959), pp. 3-13.

³ For the parallel evidence, see Zahn, *GNTK* II, 37, n. 1. Especially noteworthy is the evidence in Clement of Alexandria (Eusebius, *HE* VI, 14, 7ff.), the Muratorian Fragment, and more indirectly that of Papias (*HE* III, 39, 14ff.).

⁴ Thus Zahn writes "die Legenden, wonach der Apostel Johannes die synoptischen Evv geprüft, gebilligt und durch Hinzufügung des seinigen ergänzt habe, enthalten einen Kern, welcher durch die Nachricht des Papias vom Urteil des Johannes über Marcus, durch das tatsächliche Verhältnis des 4. Evangelisten zu den Synoptikern und durch die offenbare Bestimmung des 4. Ev für die Lesung in der Gemeindeversammlung als geschichtlich verbürgt ist". *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, p. 40. Zahn also notes that if the number of different gospels in circulation was causing difficulty in the churches, such an expedient as that contained in the legend would have been appropriate to end the chaos. *GNTK* I, 943ff.

⁵ Cullmann, however, rejects any connection of this sort between John and the

he also witnesses to the existence of a fourfold collection in the second decade of the second century.

This argument, like all arguments which rest primarily on tradition, is subject to doubt. K. L. Carroll has argued against both the early date, and against a knowledge of the Fourth Gospel before AD 150.¹ Carroll is right in pointing out that the argument for an early second century date for the collection cannot be proved, yet he too boldly rules out the possibility of the early date.² There are certain indications lending some credence to the early date which Carroll either ignores or dismisses too readily. Among these are such evidence as the Apostolic Fathers provide (particularly Ignatius and Hermas) and early apocryphal gospels which presuppose a knowledge of the canonical Gospels.³ The evidence afforded by the Rylands Papyrus 457 (P⁵²) for an early second century date for the Gospel of John is undervalued by Carroll because of his unsubstantiated opinions concerning the first use of the codex in place of the roll.⁴ If we may without difficulty date the Rylands Fragment during Hadrian's reign, we have evidence of the early circulation of the Fourth Gospel in codex form, and possibly as part of a fourfold collection.⁵

Synoptics. For him, the suggestion that John was intended to supplement (or replace) the Synoptics necessitates a recognition of the "canonicity" of the latter—something which Cullmann cannot accept at this early date. "The Plurality of the Gospels as a Theological Problem in Antiquity", trans. Stanley Godman, *The Early Church*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (London, 1966), p. 43f.

¹ "The Creation of the Fourfold Gospel", *BJRL* 37 (1954-55), 68-77. Carroll writes the article specifically against Goodspeed, and fails to interact with the arguments of Zahn and Harnack.

² The same may be said for the recently expressed view of Campenhausen, who writes that all claims for a fourfold collection before Marcion "sind grundlos und beruhen allein auf willkürlichen Rücktragung einer für diesen Zeitraum anachronistischen Vorstellung". *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, p. 168f.

³ Carroll for example denies that the Egerton Papyrus 2 is based on the fourfold Gospel. Jeremias, however, has recently affirmed this as probable. Hennecke-Schneemelcher I, 95. Crehan also calls attention to the significance of the Gospel of Truth as a witness to the existence of the canonical Gospels. *Op. cit.*, p. 4.

⁴ "The Creation of the Fourfold Gospel", p. 71. Carroll quotes Goodspeed as holding that the codex was used first only shortly before the middle of the second century. He fails to note, however, that much later, Goodspeed, in his answer to C. H. Buck, argued that the codex began to be used in the first quarter of the second century. See "Ephesians and the First Edition of Paul", p. 290. Carroll's failure to allow the early use of the codex also misled him in his dating of the Pauline Corpus. See above, p. 328.

⁵ C. H. Roberts allows the possibility that the codex included the four Gospels, but thinks it improbable since the codex would have had to contain, using a proportionate amount of space, 288 leaves, thereby making it very large for early codices. "An Un-

To be sure, even when we have attested the circulation and use of the four Gospels in the early decades of the second century we have not thereby proved the use of a single fourfold collection. It is conceivable that the four circulated individually before being brought together in a single corpus. The four may, in fact, have been circulating along with, and not differentiated from, numerous other gospels. This point of view is accepted by those who regard the first collection as a counterblast to Marcion's single Gospel.¹ However, a date of AD 150 or later for the *initial* collection is far from being established. The publication of a Catholic corpus including the four Gospels and the thirteen epistles of Paul together in reaction to Marcion does not preclude the possibility of earlier collections.²

It is clear, then, that we cannot speak with any certainty concerning the original collection of the four Gospels. Since Ignatius seems to know both the Synoptics and John, it is possible that the collection dates from early in the second century. If Clement knew the Fourth Gospel, as some contend, the date of the collection could perhaps be pushed back still further. Yet our study has shown that Clement's knowledge of this Gospel is improbable, and thus it seems unlikely that he knew of the collection. The Gospels which he did know had come to him individually rather than in any collection. There is no evidence which can substantiate the existence of an earlier threefold collection, consisting only of the Synoptic Gospels.

3. *Other Writings*

The history of the canon shows that many of the remaining books of the NT found universal acceptance very late and with much difficulty. It appears that while the fourfold Gospel and the thirteen Epistles of

published Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library", *BJRL* 20 (1936), 50f. All the early examples of the codex which are extant are too small to have contained the four Gospels. Cf. Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, p. 203f.

¹ Knox conjectures that the collection was made in Rome between AD 150 and 175 *Marcion and the NT*, p. 152. Carroll suggests AD 155 for the first collection. "The Creation of the Fourfold Gospel", p. 77.

² Carroll appears to have misunderstood Harnack at this point. "The Creation of the Fourfold Gospel", p. 76. Harnack did allow that the anti-Marcionite prologues were composed for the "earliest Catholic edition" of the Gospels, but he also made it clear that the first fourfold collection dated from the reign of Hadrian. See "Die ältesten Evangelien-Prologe und die Bildung des Neuen Testaments", *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Jahrgang 1928 (Berlin), p. 337.

Paul were accepted without dispute at least as early as Irenaeus, the status of many of the other writings was not finally settled until well into the fourth century.¹ The book of Acts, with its close relationship both to the Gospels and Pauline Corpus, was readily accepted everywhere from the first. In the Greek church Hebrews was eventually accepted as a part of the Pauline Corpus (Eusebius, Athanasius), and the seven Catholic epistles (witnessed to by Eusebius), were accepted by the time of Athanasius, but the Apocalypse remained disputed as late as the tenth century. In the Latin church, on the other hand, the Apocalypse was generally accepted from the end of the second century onwards (Muratorian Fragment), but Hebrews and the Catholic epistles (apart perhaps from 1 Peter and 1 John) found acceptance only gradually. This same hesitation concerning the Catholic epistles is encountered in the canon of the Syrian Church.²

The contrasting history of these writings and that of the Pauline epistles is striking and points to the conclusion that the former were only late, if at all, gathered into independent collections prior to their acceptance along with the Gospels and Pauline epistles as part of the inspired writings of the NT.³ Eusebius refers to the Catholic epistles as seven in number, and speaks of James as ἡ πρῶτη (HE II, 23, 24f.) thus possibly indicating that he knew of such a collection with James at its head. The history of the epistles in the early Church, however, does not support the existence or circulation of this Corpus, as in the case of the Pauline epistles.⁴ Similarly, nothing can be said concerning the existence of a separate Johannine Corpus consisting of the Gospel and the Epistles, with or without the Apocalypse.⁵

¹ The Festal Letter of Athanasius (AD 367) is the earliest witness for the contents (but not order) of the NT as it has come down to us.

² For the evidence supporting this and the preceding statements, see Kümmel, *op. cit.*, pp. 347-354.

³ Sanday correctly writes "The comparative slowness with which the other [Catholic] epistles took their place has about it nothing surprising. There was not here the safeguard of a collection". *Inspiration*, p. 367. Cf. Zahn, *GNTK* I, 950ff. *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, p. 40.

⁴ Kümmel writes that despite the possible significance of the number, "the Catholic epistles did not come to be seven in number as the result of an intentional process, but rather because of a slow, fluctuating historical development". *Op. cit.*, p. 283. On the late development of the influence of the Catholic epistles, see Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, p. 227.

⁵ See Moule, *op. cit.*, p. 206ff.

These writings—Hebrews, the seven Catholic epistles, and the Apocalypse—circulated from the beginning only as individual writings. Witness to them in the Apostolic Fathers, where it exists, is to be accounted for in this way. Just as Hebrews was not a part of Clement's Pauline Corpus, but was known to him as an individual epistle, thus Clement knew and made use of 1 Peter and James as apostolic writings circulating individually.

The fact that most of these writings were disputed for more than two centuries suggests that originally their circulation and apostolic attestation were regional. Unlike the Gospels and the Pauline epistles, they did not possess the *prima facie* unity which would suggest their early collection into a corpus. Thus circulating individually, they together with other early writings—including certain of the Apostolic Fathers¹—became a part of the literature of the first two centuries which, from the time of Marcion onwards, was subject to continued examination in defining the limits of the canon.

We thus conclude it probable that Clement knew only one collection of writings, a Pauline Corpus of ten (or thirteen) epistles. The other NT writings known to him were in circulation individually, just as some of the Pauline epistles had circulated a few years earlier before the formation of the Corpus. The Gospels were not yet formed into the fourfold collection although Clement probably knew the three Synoptics.

It should be noted, however, that while the circulation, the use, and the collection of writings must precede their acceptance as canonical, the latter is by no means guaranteed by the former activities. Thus it is not enough merely to point to the use of certain writings as evidence of their canonicity.² We must therefore attempt to determine how these writings were regarded by the early Christians.

B. AUTHORITY AND INSPIRATION

There is, unfortunately, very little direct evidence of the exact way in which the Apostolic Fathers conceived of the writings of the Apostles

¹ Cf. Zahn, *GNTK* I, 967. Clement's epistle itself was regarded very highly in the early Church and approached, if it did not quite attain, canonicity. See Lightfoot I, 1, 366-378.

² This was one of Harnack's main objections to Zahn's writings on the origin of the NT. The fact that certain writings were read privately, or even publicly, does not assure them a place in the canon. See *The Origin of the NT*, pp. 218-229. Cf. Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, p. 123f.

and their circle. They indicate no consciousness of the problem which confronts the student of the canon concerning the early relationship between these newer writings and those of the OT. This came only with the second half of the second century and was due in no small measure to the stimulus of Marcion. It is not difficult to see, however, that from the very beginning these writings were held in high regard.

The prime source of authority in the early Church is unquestionably to be found in the person of Jesus, as is exemplified in the briefest creedal statement, "Jesus is Lord". From the beginning the words of Jesus were accorded an absolute authority.¹ They were certainly held to be equal to the OT Scriptures in authority, and were perhaps even regarded as surpassing them.² Initially, however, these words were not those found in any particular written source, but rather words which had been handed down orally through the Apostles. Even after they were written down in gospels, they continued to be quoted, as they had been received, through oral tradition. The source of authority was thus regarded as Jesus himself rather than any particular writing about him.³

We have found this illustrated in Clement's citation of sayings of Jesus. In both places (13.2; 46.8) Clement cites the words of Jesus via oral tradition as authoritative. They are not cited as written words, though Clement could doubtless have quoted them from the Synoptic Gospels had he chosen to do so. While they are not cited as *γραφή* as are OT passages, they are clearly of equal authority. This is particularly evident from the introductory words for the citation in 13.2. There, immediately after citing an OT passage (Je. 9.23f.) under the rubric *λέγει γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*, he continues his exhortation with the words *μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*. The use of the emphatic *μάλιστα* underlines the high authority of the words of

¹ Cf. especially Paul's reverence for sayings of Jesus, 1 Cor. 9.14; 7.10ff., 25; 1 Thes. 4.15; see also Acts 20.35.

² The truth of this is underlined by the fact that Clement can ascribe OT texts to Jesus. Thus in chapter 22 Clement quotes a long passage from Ps. 33, introducing it with the words *καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς [Χριστός] διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου οὕτως προσκαλεῖται ἡμᾶς*. Cf. E. Flesseman-Van Leer, *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church* (Assen, 1953), p. 20. J. Leipoldt is thus justified in writing "Die Autorität der Herrenworte war ebenso gross, in Wirklichkeit vielleicht sogar grösser, als die Autorität des Alten Testaments". *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Leipzig, 1907), p. 107. Cf. Schrenk, *TDNT* I, 757; Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, p. 5f.

³ Cf. Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, p. 143f.

Jesus, alongside that of the OT Scriptures.¹ The words following the citation are equally significant :

ταύτη τῇ ἐντολῇ καὶ τοῖς παραγγέλμασιν τούτοις στηρίζωμεν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὸ πορεύεσθαι ὑψηλούς ὄντας τοῖς ἁγιοπρεπέσι λόγοις αὐτοῦ, ταπεινοφρονοῦντες. φησὶν γὰρ ὁ ἅγιος λόγος · ἐπὶ τίνα ἐπιβλέψω, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν πρᾶυν καὶ ἡσύχιον καὶ τρέμοντά μου τὰ λόγια :

Here the OT passage is linked with the words of Jesus; the latter are described as "holy" and are understood as included in the *λόγια* referred to in the passage from Is. 66.2.

If the Lord was regarded as supremely authoritative, those who were designated Apostles by him were also given to share in his authority. This is evident not only from the apostolic writings themselves,² but also from certain statements in the Apostolic Fathers. Clement clearly indicated this unique relationship between the Apostles and Christ (42.1) : οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῖν εὐηγγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξεπέμφθη · ὁ Χριστὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ · ἐγένοντο οὖν ἀμφοτέρω εὐτάκτως ἐκ θελήματος θεοῦ. Clement's purpose in writing this is to lay before his readers the foundation of the authority of bishops and deacons who were in turn appointed by the Apostles. The whole point of the passage thus turns on the question of authority.³ The Apostles are held to be in a class by themselves sharing in the authority of the Lord in large if not equal measure;⁴ the appointed officers of the Church likewise have their portion of authority which demands respectful obedience. This does not, however, put the bishops and deacons on the same level as the Lord and the

¹ Cf. Knopf, *Die Apostolischen Väter* I, 64. "Neben das Wort des heiligen Geistes im AT tritt die zweite lehrende und gesetzgebende Grösse, der Herr. Die Schriften und der Herr geben die grundlegenden Weisungen für Glauben und Leben der Gemeinde". Cf. Flesseman-Van Leer, "Prinzipien der Sammlung und Ausscheidung bei der Bildung des Kanons", p. 406.

² E.g. Gal. 1.11-17; 1 Cor. 2; 1 Cor. 14.37; 2 Cor. 10.18; 1 Thess. 2.13. See W. Sanday, *Inspiration*, pp. 350-359. Kümmel, *op. cit.*, p. 336.

³ See A. W. Ziegler, *Neue Studien zum ersten Klemensbrief* (München, 1958), p. 108. For a full discussion of the possible implications of this passage for tradition and apostolic succession in the early Church, see Flesseman-Van Leer, *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church*, p. 24ff. Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht* (Tübingen, 1953), p. 171f. See also A. Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Succession* (London, 1953), p. 76ff.

⁴ The authority of the apostolate receives full discussion in Cullmann's essay "The Tradition", *The Early Church*, especially p. 75ff. There is no reason why its importance for the emergence of the NT canon must be limited to the late date of 150, as Cullmann does. (*Ibid.*, pp. 87-98).

Apostles. Bishop Ignatius, the strong upholder of episcopacy, makes this clear when he writes οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν · ἐκεῖνοι ἀπόστολοι, ἐγὼ κατὰκριτος (*Rom.* 4.3, cf. the same in *Tral.* 3.3). Similarly Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, stresses the uniqueness of the Apostle Paul, οὔτε γὰρ ἐγὼ οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου, referring also to his teaching the word of truth and writing epistles (*Phil.* 3.2).¹

Clement's immediate purpose in the passage mentioned is the emphasis of authority as a countercheck against the disorder in the Corinthian Church. It is clear, however, that the implications of this authority are much wider in scope. For in addition to Clement's obvious veneration of the Apostles (cf. 44.1f.; 47.4; 5.2ff.), he often alludes to apostolic writings and specifically appeals to Paul's words as authoritative (47.1): ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου · ἡ γὰρ πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπολλῶ. Since the Apostles were directly commissioned by the Lord, they partook of his authority, and it was therefore only natural that their words were regarded as authoritative for the Church.² This is vividly illustrated by Ignatius who set side by side the ordinances of the Lord and the Apostles (*Magn.* 13.1): σπουδάξετε οὖν βεβαιωθῆναι ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων. We may also compare with this the absorbing interest of Papias in the words spoken by the Apostles (*HE* III, 39, 4).

The words of Jesus, as we have seen, were cited by Clement alongside of, and with an authority equal to, that of the OT Scriptures. The words of the Apostles for Clement deserve, at least implicitly, to be placed alongside those of the Lord. This close relationship is made explicit by Ignatius and holds true for the Apostolic Fathers generally. It would seem to follow that the apostolic writings themselves possess an authority which would rank them beside the OT Scriptures. While this is a true and obvious deduction, the early Church was remarkably slow in bringing it to expression.

Although there is no question of the authority of the apostolic

¹ Westcott thus writes that "Without having any exact sense of the completeness of the Christian Scriptures, they [the Apostolic Fathers] still drew a line between them and their own writings". *History of the Canon*, p. 57.

² See J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, "Tradition and Authority in the Early Church", *Studia Patristica* VII, TU 92 (Berlin, 1966), especially pp. 8-11.

writings, they are not generally accorded the status of "Scripture" in the first half of the second century. Early glimpses of the later valuation are perhaps to be seen in Polycarp (*Phil.* 6.3) and Ignatius (*Phila.* 9.1) where the Apostles are clearly paralleled with the Prophets. The parallel authority of writings on the other hand is first clearly suggested in 2 Cl. 14.2 (τὰ βιβλία καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι)¹ and 2 Pet. 3.2 (μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ρημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου, [Cf. 3.15f.]). In the Apostolic Fathers, introductory formulae are used in very few instances and practically never include the terms *γραφὴ*, *γέγραπται*, etc.² Similarly, nothing is said specifically about the inspiration of the apostolic writings. Words of the latter are not attributed to the Holy Spirit as are quotations from the OT. Clement, it is true, says that Paul wrote to the Corinthians ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς (47.3), yet this obviously does not imply inspiration like that of the OT, since Clement and Ignatius can speak similarly of their own epistles.³ The Holy Spirit was apparently regarded as working in and through all who ministered in the name of Christ. We are thus faced with a contrast in the citation of OT Scriptures and in the use of the writings of our NT which is particularly evident in Clement's epistle, but present in the Apostolic Fathers to the middle of the second century.

How are we to account for the fact that these apostolic writings did not immediately take their place beside the OT as "Scripture"? In view of the high authority ascribed by Clement and the Apostolic Fathers to Christ and the Apostles, it is wrong to suggest that the words and writings of the latter were regarded as inferior to the OT Scriptures in authority. The explanation seems to lie in a complex of attendant circumstances, rather than in any deficiency of intrinsic merit. In particular, we indicate the following four points. (1) In the early second century the authority of the Lord and Apostles had not yet fully passed

¹ There are, however, other possible interpretations of this passage. See Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London, 1948), p. 27.

² The exceptional cases are Barn 4.14; 2 Cl. 2.4; and possibly Poly. *Phil.* 12.1 (cf. 2 Pet. 3.16 and 1 Tim. 5.8). See above, p. 272ff. Even if the date and significance of these passages be agreed upon, they remain anomalous.

³ Clement thus refers to the contents of his epistle as τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν γεγραμμένοις διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (63.2). Similarly, in 59.1 he speaks of τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δι' ἡμῶν εἰρημένοις. Cf. Ign. *Phila.* 7.1f. Sanday compares statements from Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, suggesting that in all of these we encounter "the same sort of survival or overflow of the consciousness which is so strong in the authors of the Canonical Books of both Testaments". *Inspiration*, p. 386. Cf. Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

from oral proclamation, its original locus, to the written documents which provided the record of that proclamation.¹ That is, the availability of a still living oral tradition in the early second century made it difficult for any writings to achieve an unrivalled prominence parallel to that of the OT.² As oral tradition began to wane, attention became more and more focused on the permanent records, which came correspondingly closer to being recognized as possessing the status of Scripture.³ In the period of the Apostolic Fathers, however, no distinct line was drawn between oral and written authority. Here we are still close enough to the Apostles for kerygma and didache to be handed down in relative purity via oral tradition.⁴ This is illustrated in Clement's dependence upon oral tradition, his possible use of paraenetic tradition, and more indirectly by the freedom of his allusions to the apostolic writings.⁵ (2) The epistolary form and personal character of many of the apostolic writings is radically different from anything encountered in the Scriptures of the OT. The Gospels indeed represent a genre of literature not far removed from certain historical books of the OT. But it was precisely the material contained in the Gospels that was most effectively perpetuated in oral tradition and kerygma. The epistles, on the other hand, have a unique character which is not paralleled

¹ R. Heard correctly speaks of "an earlier state [i.e. prior to Papias] in the history of the canon where Christian writing circulated, but the question of apostolic authority concerned men rather than documents". "Papias' Quotations from the New Testament". *NTS* 1 (1954-55), 134.

² R. H. Fuller writes "The fact that there was a 'living voice', then, was the primary reason why during period I [95-130] there was as yet no NT canon or any idea of one". *A Critical Introduction to the NT* (London, 1966), p. 192. "The authoritative teaching of the Apostles was fresh in the memories of their hearers". Westcott, *History of the Canon*, p. 19; cf. p. 47.

³ Cf. Flesseman-Van Leer, *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church*, p. 189.

⁴ Braun correctly writes "L'autorité des paroles du Seigneur et des apôtres n'était pas inférieure à celles des écrits prophétiques, mais elle venait de ceux qui les avaient proférées, non de leurs organes de transmission". *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l'Église Ancienne*, I, 173.

⁵ It is true that OT writings are also occasionally alluded to with considerable freedom by Clement. The majority of OT quotations, however, are very nearly verbatim, whereas Clement never quotes the NT in exact verbatim agreement. It is wrong to conclude as does Blackman that this difference speaks of an inferior authority ascribed to the apostolic writings. Cf. *Marcion and His Influence*, p. 28. L. E. Wright's observation is an interesting one in this connection: "As to canons of accuracy in citation, it is evident that the words of Jesus are not quoted with an appreciably stricter accuracy as the result of authoritative definition in the NT canon" [i.e. in Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian]. *Alterations of the Words of Jesus*, p. 116.

in the OT, so that for them the appropriateness of the title "Scripture" is not readily apparent. This by no means made such a designation impossible, but perhaps served as a factor in delaying it. (3) The apostolic writings above all lacked antiquity and therefore the status and esteem that naturally attaches to writings which have been revered for centuries.¹ It was no doubt initially difficult to regard writings originating a mere 75 years or so earlier as fully belonging to a class of writings so venerable as those of the OT. However, to say that certain writings are inferior in age by no means necessitates the conclusion that they are inferior in authority. The apostolic writings possess the highest authority, yet are in a category separate from the OT; this is particularly true in the present instance where the newer apostolic writings possessed the authority of the Lord. (4) A very important reason, related to the above, for the reluctance to refer to apostolic writings as "Scripture" is simply that it had not become customary to do so. The term "Scripture" and the formula "It is written" were convenient for reference to a more or less clearly defined body of writings which the Church had inherited from Judaism. Despite the acknowledged authority of the apostolic writings—an authority which at least implicitly equaled that of the OT—it was no small innovation to apply the title to the newer writings, thereby going against traditional usage. Moreover, since these writings bore the authority of Christ, it is quite possible that in the early Church no need was felt for designating them "Scripture"—and no advantage either, since the Jews would simply dispute the claim.² Accordingly, the impetus for such designation may well have been lacking, at least prior to the time of Marcion.³

We conclude then, that from our earliest witness onwards the Apostolic Fathers maintain the certain authority of the writings of the Apostles. The writings do not intrinsically become more authoritative over the decades, but rather their authority assumes greater importance and is expressed with greater clarity with the diminishing effectiveness

¹ Streeter calls attention to this but wrongly concludes that the NT writings lacked authority, and were regarded simply as "classics". *The Four Gospels*, p. 4.

² We may compare the difficulty of Ignatius in *Phila.* 8.2. It was not enough to answer *γέγραπται* to his opponents, for that led either to the further question of OT hermeneutics or to the question of whether the Gospels were *γραφή*.

³ Thus Grant may be correct when he says of the period of the Apostolic Fathers that "the question of 'scripture' was not especially significant" (p. 108) and that they were possibly "not interested in the question" (p. 124), *The Formation of the NT*.

of oral tradition. The Apostolic Fathers are essentially united in their witness to the authority of the new writings; there is no radical change in the valuation of these writings between AD 95 and AD 140.¹ There is thus no reason, as is often done, to separate Clement's epistle from those of Ignatius and Polycarp as witnessing to an earlier stage in the valuation of the writings. Clement is at one with the Apostolic Fathers in this matter, and the most that may be detected over this period of five decades is a gradual realization of the implications of the authority of the new writings and the consequent gradual appearance of terminology previously reserved for the writings of the OT.²

Similarly, if the authority of the apostolic writings was recognized from the earliest period, it is wrong to suggest that Marcion was the cause of a radically new assessment of those writings. There can be no question about the importance of Marcion as a stimulus upon the early Church. But what Marcion brought about was simply the need for making explicit what had been held from the beginning, namely the authoritative character of the NT writings and, more implicitly, their rightful position alongside the Jewish Scriptures. The authority of the apostolic writings was apparently largely taken for granted in the early Church. However, when Marcion produced his canon of one Gospel and ten Epistles, the Church was forced to make clear its acceptance of *four* Gospels and all apostolic writings. At the same time, Marcion's repudiation of the Jewish Scriptures provided the ideal opportunity for the explicit affirmation not only of the authority of the OT, but of the coordinate authority and position of the NT. This recognition and spelling out of what was implicit had already begun before Marcion and would have continued without him.³ Marcion,

¹ Grant correctly writes that, with respect to the NT canon, the Apostolic Fathers are "too close in time for us to be sure that there was any definite development". *Ibid.*, p. 63.

² The few early references in the Apostolic Fathers to NT writings as "Scripture" (see above, p. 341, n. 2) are remarkable for their casualness. There is certainly no awareness of a new valuation of the writings in question. These introductory formulae point to the authoritativeness of the new writings and may be regarded as an unconscious testimony to the parallel status of the new with the old. R. M. Grant, speaking of Clement's use of the Pauline epistles, is thus correct in remarking that already "the possibility of a written authority beyond the Old Testament has arisen". *CHB* I, 292.

³ Cf. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence*, p. 24.

however, is responsible for having greatly accelerated a process which might otherwise have taken considerably longer.¹

Much confusion in the attempt to understand the developments of the second century and particularly the role of Marcion has been caused by the simple problem of semantics. Many statements are misleading because of the failure to indicate exactly what is intended by the words "New Testament" and "canon". In our opinion, the dispute between Harnack and Zahn on this subject was in large measure due to semantic difficulties.² Whether one first speaks of a "NT" and a "canon" at the beginning, or at the end of the second century depends entirely on the meaning given to the words. Speaking strictly, one can justify the use of the words "NT" and "canon" only for the period following Marcion.³ It is from Marcion that our first list or "canon" of writings comes; it is Marcion's contrasting of the Jewish Scriptures as false with the Christian Scriptures as true that led to the Church's distinction between old and new.⁴ Consequently, prior to the time of Marcion, the words "canon" and "NT" are anachronistic.

Nevertheless, it is also possible in the recognition of this fact to overestimate the importance of Marcion's role. Although we cannot speak of a "NT" before Marcion, it is misleading to conclude that Marcion created the NT;⁵ although before Marcion we cannot speak of a "canon", it is misleading to conclude that before the middle of the second century, NT writings were not regarded as Scripture.⁶ It must

¹ C. S. C. Williams has correctly pointed this out: "It may be that Marcion accelerated the tendency of Christians to place Paul's epistles on a par with the written Gospels and the Old Testament, but the tendency was already there". *Op. cit.*, p. 45. Cf. Kümmel's judicious remarks on the significance of Marcion for the development of the NT canon. *Introduction to the NT*, p. 342f.

² This is evident itself from Harnack's criticism of Zahn's position. See *The Origin of the NT*, pp. 218-229. A further indication of the semantical nature of the problem is to be seen in Sanday's criticism, ironically, of Harnack's position. See *Inspiration*, pp. 61-63.

³ In absolute strictness, i.e. if by "the NT" we mean a recognition of our 27 Books as alone canonical, we may have to wait until the fourth century to use the words. For the earliest use of the expression ἡ καθὴ διαθήκη in referring to the NT writings, see W. C. van Unnik "H καθὴ διαθήκη—a Problem in the early History of the Canon", *Studia Patristica*, vol. 4, TU 79 (Berlin, 1961), 212-227.

⁴ Knox, *Marcion and the NT*, p. 31.

⁵ Campenhausen speaks of Marcion as "der Schöpfer der christlichen heiligen Schrift". *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, p. 192; cf. p. 173f.

⁶ Thus Flesseman-Van Leer, "Prinzipien der Sammlung und Ausscheidung bei der Bildung des Kanons", p. 406.

be remembered that the apostolic writings were regarded as authoritative long before Marcion's day. The authority of these writings depended not on any list or "canon", but upon the apostolic commission of the authors, and that in turn upon the Lord himself. Apostolicity thus initially exercised a limitative function similar to the later function of the canon: it was the apostolic writings that were uniquely authoritative.¹ To be sure, it took a considerable time before universal agreement was reached concerning which books were genuinely from the Apostles or bore apostolic authority. But the authority itself did not depend upon a list or canon.²

The early circulation of apostolic writings individually and in collections (the Pauline Corpus, the four Gospels) makes it possible to speak of an "incipient canon"³ prior to the activity of Marcion,⁴ and indeed, perhaps as early as Clement of Rome. Similarly, since these new writings are authoritative, they are implicitly parallel to the older author-

¹ Sundberg fails to appreciate the central significance of apostolicity for the authority of the NT writings in the early Church. "Towards a Revised History of the New Testament Canon", *Studia Evangelica*, vol. 4, TU 102 (Berlin, 1968), 452-461.

² Campenhausen writes "Dass der christliche wie der jüdische Kanon in seinem Umfang noch nicht völlig feststeht, tut seiner Autorität keinen Abbruch". *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, p. 79. This is also true of the NT writings before the time of Marcion. Cf. Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

³ The situation is, in fact, very similar to the state of the OT canon in the Church at the end of the first century. There was no agreement yet as to its exact extent, but we do not hesitate to speak in terms of a "canon". Clement quotes certain OT writings as Scripture because he regarded them as inspired and authoritative. They were therefore canonical for him. See above, pp. 111-120.

⁴ R. P. C. Hanson correctly remarks "It was not Marcion's drastic higher criticism which set in motion the process of forming a canon of the NT, for such a canon was known before the middle of the second century". *Tradition in the Early Church*, p. 190. C. S. C. Williams remarks that "From the early days of the Church, the conception of canonicity was not unknown, at least in connection with the Old Testament". *Op. cit.*, p. 45. R. M. Grant similarly notes that concern in the early Church for the limits of the OT canon quite naturally led to the question of NT canon. "The New Testament Canon", *CHB* I, 300. Cf. Campenhausen's use of the word "kanonisch" with reference to the words of Jesus. *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, p. 124. Cf. Westcott, *History of the Canon*, p. 21.

itative writings,¹ and it is perhaps not improper to say that the "NT" in this sense began to exist from the time of Clement.²

Apart from the question of semantics, however, what needs to be emphasized again is that Marcion was not the cause of a radical change in the valuation of the apostolic writings.³ Beginning with Clement, through the Apostolic Fathers, and to the end of the second century a continuity in the witness to the authority of the apostolic writings is evident.⁴ Sanday, in his criticism of Harnack, has, in our judgement, accurately summed up the conclusion to which one is inclined after an examination of the Apostolic Fathers :

The potentiality of the New Testament was there from the first moment when the Lord and His Apostles began to open their lips in public teaching. There was never any change in the estimate of the value and authority of that teaching... When the Church began to reflect and define, it merely gave conscious and deliberate expression to feelings which had been present inarticulately throughout.⁵

Indirect confirmation of this conclusion is perhaps found in the Gnostics Basilides and Valentinus. Writing in Alexandria during the reign of Trajan and thus before the time of Marcion's influence, Basilides plainly regarded the Gospels and Pauline epistles as equal to the OT Scriptures, employing the standard introductory formulae *γέγραπται*,

¹ We have already pointed out that at this early date the parallel between the OT and writings of the NT is somewhat blurred due to the fact that the authority at first lay in the message as proclaimed by living tradition rather than only in written documents. This, together with other factors we have mentioned, delayed an emphasis upon the new writings as "Scripture". Cf. Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*, pp. 77; 172; 217. Knoch, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

² We may agree with Carroll that the rapid growth of pseudepigrapha and apocrypha in the second century encouraged a precise definition of the extent of the NT canon. But to say that this "created" the "earliest NT" between AD 170-180 is misleading. "The Earliest New Testament", *BJRL* 38 (1955-56), 45-57.

³ Blackman's assessment of Marcion's influence is well worth repeating: "Marcion introduced the first fixed canon of Christian Scriptures; but this is to be regarded as a published selection of books by an advocate of sectarian ideas, and by no means as the source of the notion of authoritative Scripture". *Op. cit.*, p. 32.

⁴ We do not agree with Hanson who writes that the study of the NT canon in the second century is "a history of increasing authority being conferred upon it". *Tradition in the Early Church*, p. 212. Again, however, we may be confronted with semantic difficulty since Hanson is speaking of the designation of the apostolic writings as "Scripture". We argue that this designation is neither caused by, nor the cause of, an increased authority, but rather the expression of an authority already implicitly recognized.

⁵ *Inspiration*, p. 63; cf. p. 14.

ἡ γραφὴ λέγει.¹ In Rome between AD 140-145, Valentinus, if he wrote the Gospel of Truth as van Unnik has argued, witnesses to the authority of a collection of NT books identical with the NT of Tertullian.² Here too, then, we may be confronted with a collection of authoritative apostolic writings prior to Marcion. The evidence of Basilides and the Gospel of Truth becomes intelligible with the recognition of the continuity of the witness to the authority of the apostolic writings, and is difficult to reconcile with the suggestion that Marcion is responsible for the creation of the NT.³

We conclude, then, that no great change in the valuation of the new writings took place between the time of Clement and the end of the second century. What we do see is an increasing awareness of the implications of the position held from the beginning, and the effects of this growing awareness upon the terminology and formulation applied to the apostolic writings.

C. INTERPRETATION

As is true of the Apostolic Fathers generally, there is little that can be said about actual "interpretation" of apostolic writings in Clement's epistle. In the first half of the second century we are still in the period when the unadorned kerygma is of central importance. That is, the need for precise definition and systematization of the doctrine of the Church was not yet apparent. The true tradition was still available from those who had received it directly from the Apostles.⁴ Further, the transition from emphasis upon the oral message of the Apostles to emphasis upon the writings of the Apostles had not yet fully taken

¹ For the reliability of Hippolytus' account of Basilides, see Grant, *The Formation of the NT*, p. 122f.

² Thus van Unnik, "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament", *The Jung Codex*, ed. F. L. Cross (London, 1955), p. 123. Van Unnik indicates that "c. 150 this 'canon'—even if the later use of this word was not yet known—was in use, as far as its main items are concerned, at Rome", and that if this is the case the NT books "must have already enjoyed authority for a considerable time". *Ibid.*, p. 125.

³ Failure to recognize this continuity forces F. E. Vokes to date the Didache later than 150 AD, since its "use of the word εὐαγγέλιον and its introductory formulae for quotations has set it in the period after the emergence of the NT as scripture". "The Didache and the Canon of the NT", *Studia Evangelica*, vol. 3, TU 88 (Berlin, 1964), 435.

⁴ Cf. Flesseman-Van Leer, *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church*, p. 188f.

place. With the increasing distance in time from the source of the tradition, and with the full onset of competitive systems—particularly Gnosticism—came the need for exact definition and thus towards the end of the second century we can first speak of a conscious “interpretation” or “explanation” of the writings of the Apostles.¹

Clement's use of the writings of the Apostles is controlled, in the same way that his use of the OT is, by the immediate purpose of his epistle. That purpose is to exhort the Corinthians to a conduct befitting those who acknowledge Jesus as Lord. In fulfilment of this purpose Clement primarily resorts to direct exhortation, example, promise, and warning. This is clearly reflected in the paraenetic use made of both OT Scriptures and apostolic writings. Thus these elements, singly or in combination, underlie the use of Hebrews in chapter 36, the use of 1 Corinthians in chapters 47 and 49, the use of Romans in chapter 35, as well as the majority of the other allusions to the NT.

The use made of the apostolic writings underlines the fact that the purpose of the epistle is hortatory rather than didactic. The passages alluded to are either themselves paraenetic or adaptable to Clement's paraenetic purpose. But the meaning of passages used in this way is easy to see. They are taken literally and their sense is immediately obvious; there are no questions or problems and thus there is no need for explanation or interpretation.

One can reconstruct something of Clement's theology from his allusion to the NT, but the materials of such a reconstruction are incidental in character.² The ideas of Christology, Atonement, Justification, etc., while present, are neither explained nor elaborated. In Clement's concern for the practical rather than the doctrinal, the apostolic writings are alluded to in complete simplicity. Just as there is no exegesis, there is no allegorizing of these writings.³ Instead, there is

¹ Cf. Hanson, *Tradition in the Early Church*, p. 117f.

² It is beyond the scope of the present work to expound the theology of Clement's epistle. Short treatments of this subject are available in Donaldson, *The Apostolical Fathers*, pp. 153-180; Lightfoot I, 1, 396-400; Clarke, *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*, pp. 20-30; Grant, *AF I*, 116-120.

³ Hanson suggests the earliest allegorization of the NT as a test for determining when the NT writings were first regarded as Scripture on a level with the OT. *Tradition in the Early Church*, p. 208. It is probably true that the Apostolic Fathers did not allegorize because they emphasized the proclamation rather than the writings of the Apostles. However, it is not beyond credibility that had Clement had occasion to do so, he may well have allegorized some of the parables of Jesus. Yet it should also be remembered that in his extensive use of the OT, Clement allegorizes only once or twice.

straightforward citation or allusion with the import being unmistakable: Because what was spoken (or done) by the Apostles is true, Christians are under obligation to act accordingly. While this immediacy is even clearer with regard to the extensive use made of the OT, it is also evident in the (more allusive) use made of the NT.

Thus while Clement is an important witness for the use of the writings of the NT in AD 95, and thus indirectly for the prehistory of the canon, he provides us with no indication of his own hermeneutic approach to these writings. He puts the writings of the OT Scriptures and those of the Apostles to very much the same use; they are repositories of truth—truth not in an abstract or theoretical sense, but as the impetus for Christian conduct.

APPENDIX I

OLD TESTAMENT (LXX) CITATIONS IN CLEMENT

Only citations and the most important verbal allusions are listed. Following the LXX references, indication is given as to the nature of the quotation : (e) exact or nearly so; (mv) moderately variant; (v) variant; (c) composite. Allusions are put in parentheses.

<i>Genesis</i>	<i>Clement</i>	<i>1 Reigns</i>	<i>Clement</i>
(1.9)	20.6	2.10 (c)	13.1
1.26f. (e)	33.5	13.14 (c)	18.1
1.28 (e)	33.6		
2.23 (e)	6.3		
4.3-8 (e)	4.1-6	<i>Job</i>	
12.1-3 (e)	10.3	1.1 (mv)	17.3
13.14-16 (e)	10.4f	4.16-5.5 (c)	39.3-9
15.5f. (mv)	10.6	5.17-26 (e)	56.6-15
15.5 (c)	32.2	11.2f. (e)	30.4f.
18.27 (e)	17.2	14.4f. (mv)	17.4
22.17 (c)	32.2	15.15 (c)	39.5
26.4 (c)	32.2	19.26 (mv)	26.3
		38.11 (v)	20.7
<i>Exodus</i>			
2.14 (e)	4.10	<i>Psalms</i> (LXX numbering)	
3.11 (c)	17.5	2.7f. (e)	36.4
4.10 (c)	17.5	3.6 (c)	26.2
(14.23)	51.5	11.4-6 (e)	15.5-6
32.32 (mv)	53.4	17.26f. (e)	46.3
		18.2-4 (e)	27.7
<i>Numbers</i>		21.7-9 (e)	16.15f.
(12.7)	17.5; 43.1	22.4 (c)	26.2
(16.33)	51.4	23.1 (e)	54.3
		27.7 (c)	26.2
		30.19 (e)	15.5
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		31.1f. (e)	50.6
9.12-14 (e)	53.2f	31.10 (e)	22.8
32.8f. (e)	29.2	33.12-18 (e)	22.1-7
32.15 (v)	3.1	36.35-37 (mv)	14.5
		36.38 (c)	14.4
<i>Joshua</i>		(48.15)	51.4
		49.14f. (e)	52.3
2.3-5,9-14,18f. (c)	12.4-6	49.16-23 (e)	35.7-12

<i>Psalms</i> (cont.)	<i>Clement</i>	<i>Isaiah</i> (cont.)	<i>Clement</i>
50.3-19 (e)	18.2-17	40.10 (c)	34.3
50.19 (e)	52.4	53 (e)	16.3-14
61.5 (e)	15.3	(59.14)	3.4
68.31-33 (mv)	52.2	60.17 (v)	42.5
77.36f. (e)	15.4	66.2 (e)	13.4
87.11 (c)	26.2		
88.21 (e)	18.1	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
103.4 (e)	36.3	9.22f. (c)	13.1
109.1 (e)	36.5		
117.18 (e)	56.3	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
117.19f. (e)	48.2f	33.11 (mv)	8.2
138.7-10 (v)	28.3	37.12 (c)	50.4
140.5 (e)	56.5		
		<i>Daniel</i>	
		7.10 (c)	34.6
<i>Proverbs</i>		<i>Malachi</i>	
1.23-33 (e)	57.3-7	3.1 (c)	23.5
2.21 (c)	14.4		
3.12 (e)	56.4		
3.34 (e)	30.2		
(7.3)	2.8		
20.27 (v)	21.2	<i>Non-Canonical Quotations</i>	
24.12 (c)	34.3	<i>Wisdom</i>	<i>Clement</i>
		2.24	3.4
<i>Isaiah</i>		12.12	27.5
1.16-20 (e)	8.4		
(3.5)	3.3	<i>Other</i>	
6.3 (c)	34.6	? Apocryphal Ezekiel	8.3
13.22 (c)	23.5	? Assumption of Moses	17.6
26.20 (c)	50.4	? Eldad and Modad	23.3f
29.13 (mv)	15.2	? Apocryphal Ezekiel	29.3
		??	46.2

APPENDIX II

POSSIBLE ALLUSIONS TO NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS IN CLEMENT

This list contains only the more conspicuous possibilities discussed in the present work. Those which are asterisked are regarded as especially probable. In some instances these involve OT quotations common to Clement and the NT. Where this happens the OT reference is also indicated.

<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Clement</i>	<i>John</i> (cont.)	<i>Clement</i>
5.7	13.2	17.3	43.6
5.18	27.5	17.17	60.2
6.14	13.2	17.18	42.1f.
7.1f.	13.2	20.21	42.1f.
7.13f.	48.4		
7.21	30.3		
11.29f.	16.17	<i>Acts</i>	
13.3	24.5	1.2-8	42.3f.
18.6	46.8	1.8	2.2
26.24	46.8	2.4,17f.	2.2
26.28	7.4	5.17	5.4
		5.29	14.1
		12.17	5.4
<i>Mark</i>		13.22* (Ps. 88.21)	18.1
4.3	24.5	17.25	52.1
4.24	13.2	20.29f.	44.1
7.6* (Is. 29.13)	15.2	20.35	2.1
9.42	46.8	26.18	59.2
11.25	13.2		
14.21	46.8	<i>Romans</i>	
		1.29ff.*	35.5f.
<i>Luke</i>		2.24	47.7
1.14	63.2	2.29	30.6
1.46ff.	59.3	4.3 (Gn. 15.5f.)	10.6
1.68ff.	60.3; 61.3	4.7f. (Ps. 31.1f.)	50.6f.
1.75	48.4	4.9*	50.7
6.37f.	13.2	6.1*	33.1
12.14 (Ex. 2.14)	4.10	9.4*	32.2
17.2	46.8	11.33	40.1
		11.36	34.2
<i>John</i>		12.4f.	37.5; 38.1; 46.7
		13.1	61.1
3.21	31.2		
6.51	49.6		
10.9	48.4	<i>1 Corinthians</i>	
14.15	49.1	1.1f.	salutation

<i>1 Corinthians (cont.)</i>	<i>Clement</i>	<i>Colossians</i>	<i>Clement</i>
1.10ff.*	47.1	1.12f.	59.2
1.31* (Je 9.23)	13.1	2.1	2.4
2.9* (?Is. 64.3)	34.8	3.14	49.2
2.10	40.1		
4.10	3.3		
4.14	7.1	<i>1 Timothy</i>	
8.6	34.2		
12.8ff.*	48.5	2.3	7.3
12.21-27*	37.5-38.1	2.7	60.4
12.27	46.7	2.8	29.1
13*	49.5	2.9f.	33.7
15.20*	24.1	3.10	42.4
15.23*	37.3	5.21	21.7
15.36ff.*	24.5		
<i>2 Corinthians</i>		<i>2 Timothy</i>	
3.3 (Pr. 7.3)	2.8	1.3	45.7
3.18	36.2	1.6	27.3
9.8	2.7	2.2	44.2
10.12	38.2	2.22	30.1
10.13f.	41.1	3.15	45.2; 53.1
11.23ff.	5.5f.		
12.9	55.3		
<i>Galatians</i>		<i>Titus</i>	
2.9*	5.2	1.5	42.4
2.20	49.6	2.4f.*	1.3
3.1*	2.1	2.14	64.1
3.6ff.	31.2	3.1*	2.7
		3.5	32.3
<i>Ephesians</i>		<i>Hebrews</i>	
1.18	59.3		
1.19 (Wisd. 12.12)	27.5	1.3	27.4
4.4-7*	46.6	1.3f.*	36.2
4.32-5.1	14.3	1.5* (Ps. 2.7f.)	36.4
5.21	38.1	1.7* (Ps. 103.4)	36.3
<i>Philippians</i>		1.13* (Ps. 109.1)	36.5
1.10	2.5	4.12*	21.9
1.27*	21.1	6.4f.	36.2
1.30*	7.1	6.18*	27.2
2.6ff.	16.2	11*	9-12
2.21	48.6	12.1	19.2
4.3	45.8	12.1f.	7.1
4.15*	47.1	12.23	45.8

<i>James</i>	<i>Clement</i>	<i>1 Peter</i> (cont.)	<i>Clement</i>
2.15f.	30.3; 38.2	4.8* (Pr. 10.12)	49.5
2.21ff.*	10.1	5.5* (Pr. 3.34)	30.2
2.25f.*	12.1		
3.13*	38.2	<i>2 Peter</i>	
4.6 (Pr. 3.34)	30.2	2.5	7.6
4.14	17.6	3.5ff.	27.4
4.16	21.5	3.14	35.4f.
5.20 (Pr. 10.12)	49.5		
		<i>1 John</i>	
		1.7	7.4
<i>1 Peter</i>		1.9	51.3
1.2	salutation	2.2	7.4
1.15f.	7.1	3.2	35.2f.
1.18f.*	7.2ff.	4.18	49.5; 50.3
2.9	36.2; 59.2		
2.13ff.	61.1	<i>Revelation</i>	
2.25	61.3	22.12 (Is. 40.10;	34.3
3.20	9.4	Pr. 24.12)	

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. TEXTS

A. Clement of Rome

1. Primary

Codex Alexandrinus in Reduced Photographic Facsimile: New Testament and Clementine Epistles. British Museum, Introduced by F. G. Kenyon. London, 1909.

"An Autotype of the Constantinople Manuscript", J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*. I/1 (London, 1890), pp. 421-474.

Bensly, R. L. *The Epistles of S. Clement to the Corinthians in Syriac.* Cambridge, 1899.

Morin, Germanus. *Sancti Clementis Romani ad Corinthios Epistulae versio latina antiquissima.* Anecdota Maredsolana II. Maredsolii, 1894.

Rösch, F. *Bruchstücke des Ersten Clemensbriefes nach dem Achmimischen Papyrus der Strassburger Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek.* Strassburg, 1910.

Schmidt, C. *Der Erste Clemensbrief in altkoptischer Übersetzung.* TU 32, Leipzig, 1908.

2. Secondary

Bihlmeyer, K., and Schneemelcher, W. *Die Apostolischen Väter*². Tübingen, 1956.

Bryennios, Ph. *ΚΑΗΜΕΝΤΟΣ επισκόπου 'Ρώμης αἱ δύο πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολαί.* Constantinople, 1875.

Funk, F. X. *Patres Apostolici.* Tubingae, 1901.

Gebhardt, O., and Harnack, A. *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera. Clemens Romanus.* Lipsiae, 1876.

Hefele, C. J. *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera.* Tubingae, 1855.

Hilgenfeld, A. *Clementis Romani Epistulae.* Lipsiae, 1876.

Jacobsen, G. *Patrum Apostolicorum.* Oxonii, 1840.

Knopf, R. *Der Erste Clemensbrief.* TU 20, Leipzig, 1899.

Lake, K. *The Apostolic Fathers.* LCL (2 vols.), London, 1912.

Lightfoot, J. B. *The Apostolic Fathers.* Part I. S. Clement of Rome. 2nd ed. (2 vols.), London, 1890.

B. Biblical

Kittel, R. *Biblia Hebraica.* 3rd ed. Stuttgart, 1937.

Nestle, E., and Aland, K. *Novum Testamentum Graece.* 25th ed. Stuttgart, 1963.

Brooke, A. E., McLean, N., and Thackeray, H. St. J. *The Old Testament in Greek.* 9 Parts. Cambridge, 1906-1940.

Field, F. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt.* (2 vols.) Oxford, 1875.

Holmes, R., and Parsons, J. *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus.* (5 vols.) Oxford, 1798-1827.

Rahlfs, A. *Septuaginta.* (2 vols.) Stuttgart, 1935.

—, *Genesis. Septuaginta...* Soc. Litt. Gottingensis I. Stuttgart, 1926.

—, *Psalmi cum Odis. Septuaginta...* Soc. Litt. Gottingensis X. Göttingen, 1931.

Swete, H. B. *The Old Testament in Greek.* (3 vols.) Cambridge, 1887-1894.

- Ziegler, J. *Isaias*. Septuaginta ... Soc. Litt. Gottingensis XIV. Göttingen, 1939.
 —, *Ezechiel*, Septuaginta ... Soc. Litt. Gottingensis XVI, 1. Göttingen, 1952.
 —, *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*. Septuaginta ... Soc. Litt. Gottingensis XVI, 2. Göttingen, 1954.
 —, *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae*. Septuaginta ... Soc. Litt. Gottingensis XV. Göttingen, 1957.

C. Miscellaneous

- Adamantius*. GCSE. Edited by W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen. Leipzig, 1901.
Patrum Apostolicorum Opera. Edited by O. Gebhardt, A. Harnack and T. Zahn. Leipzig, 1876ff.
The Apostolic Fathers. LCL. Edited by K. Lake. London, 1912.
The Apostolic Fathers. Part II. *S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp*. Edited by J. B. Lightfoot. London, 1885.
Die Apostolischen Väter. I. *Der Hert des Hermas*, GCSE. Edited by M. Whittaker. Berlin, 1956.
Clemens Alexandrinus. GCSE. Edited by O. Stählin. Leipzig, 1905-1936.
Didascalia Apostolorum. Edited by R. H. Connolly. Oxford, 1929.
Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum. Edited by F. X. Funk. Paderbornae, 1905.
Dio's Roman History. LCL. Edited by E. Cary. London, 1914-1927.
Saint Éphrem Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Vol. 145. Edited by L. Leloir. Louvain, 1954.
Epictetus. LCL. Edited by W. A. Oldfather. London, 1926-1928.
Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History. LCL. Edited by K. Lake, J. E. L. Oulton. London, 1926-1932.
Eusebius. GCSE. Edited by H. Gressmann, J. A. Heikel, R. Helm, *et al.* Leipzig, 1908ff.
Hippolytus. GCSE. Edited by H. Achelis, G. Bonwetsch, *et al.* Leipzig, 1897ff.
Sancti Irenaei quae supersunt omnia. Edited by A. Stieren. Lipsiae, 1853.
Josephus. LCL. Edited by H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, *et al.* London. 1926-1965.
Iustini Philosophi et Martyris Opera quae feruntur omnia. Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi. Edited by J. C. T. Otto. Ienae, 1876-1880.
Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. LCL. Edited by C. R. Haines. London, 1916.
Migne, J. P. *Patrologiae cursus completus*. Series Latina (221 vols.). Series Graeca (161 vols.). Paris, 1844-1866.
Origenes. GCSE. Edited by P. Koetschau, E. Klostermann, E. Benz, *et al.* Leipzig, 1899ff.
Philo. LCL. Edited by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. London, 1929-1962.
Die Pseudoklementinen. GCSE. Edited by B. Rehm. Berlin, 1953-1965.
Tertulliani Opera. CSEL. Edited by A. Reifferscheid, G. Wissowa, A. Kroymann, *et al.* Vendobonae; Lipsiae, 1890ff.

II. REFERENCE WORKS

- Aland, K. (ed.) *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. Stuttgart, 1964.
 Altaner, Berthold. *Patrology*. Translated from the 5th German edition. Freiburg, 1960.
 Bardenhewer, O. *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*. 5 vols., 2nd ed. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1913.
 Bauer, W., translated and adapted by Arndt, W. F., and Gingrich, F. W. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Chicago, 1957.

- Buttrick, G. A. (ed.) *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. 4 vols., New York, 1962.
Cambridge History of the Bible. 3 vols., Cambridge, 1963-1970.
- Charles, R. H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols., Oxford, 1913.
- Cross, F. L. (ed.) *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. London, 1957.
 —, *The Early Christian Fathers*. London, 1960.
- Douglas, J. D. (ed.) *The New Bible Dictionary*. London, 1962.
- Galling, K. (ed.) *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. 7 vols., 3rd ed. Tübingen, 1957-1962.
- Goodspeed, E. J. (ed.) *Index Patristicus sive Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum Operum*. Leipzig, 1907.
- Hastings, J. (ed.) *A Dictionary of the Bible*. 4 vols., Edinburgh, 1898-1902.
 —, *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*. 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1915-1918.
- Hatch, E., and Redpath, H. A. (eds.) *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. 2 vols. plus supplement. Oxford, 1897-1906.
- Hennecke, E., and Schneemelcher, W. (eds.) *New Testament Apocrypha*. London, 1963-1965. Translated by R. McL. Wilson.
- Huck, A. (ed.) *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels*. 9th ed. Revised by H. Lietzmann. Translated by F. L. Cross. Oxford, 1949.
- Kittel, G. (ed.) *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 7 vols., to date. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1964ff.
- Klausner, Th. (ed.) *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*. 5 vols., to date. Stuttgart, 1950ff.
- Kraft, H. *Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum*. München, 1963.
- Lampe, G. W. H. (ed.) *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford, 1961-1968.
- Liddell, H. G., and Scott, R. (eds.) *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Revised by H. S. Jones. Oxford, 1958.
- McDonald, W. J. (ed.) *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 15 vols., New York, 1967.
- Morgenthaler, R. *Statistik des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*. Zürich, 1958.
- Moulton, W. F., and Geden, A. S. (eds.) *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*. 4th ed. Edinburgh, 1963.
- Nober, P. (ed.) *Biblica. Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus*. Vols. 47-49. (1966-1968).
- Pirot, L., Cozelles, H., and Feuillet, A. (eds.) *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément*. 8 vols., to date. Paris, 1928ff.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. 3 vols., Utrecht-Antwerp, 1950-1960.
- Schneemelcher, W. (ed.) *Bibliographia Patristica*. International Patristische Bibliographie. 10 vols., to date. Berlin, 1956-1965.
- Smith, W., and Wace, H. (eds.) *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*. 4 vols. London, 1877.

III. BOOKS

- Armstrong, G. T. *Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Biblischen Hermeneutik 4. Tübingen, 1962.
- Audet, J.-P. *La Didaché*. Études Bibliques. Paris, 1958.
- Bacon, B. W. *Studies in Matthew*. New York, 1930.

- Barnard, L. W. *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background*. Oxford, 1966.
- , *Justin Martyr*. Cambridge, 1967.
- Barnard, P. M. *The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles*. TS 5. Cambridge, 1899.
- Barnett, A. E. *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*. Chicago, 1941.
- Bauer, W. *Die Apostolischen Väter. Die Brief des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief*. HZNT, Ergänzungsband 2. Tübingen, 1920.
- , *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 10. Tübingen, 1934.
- Beare, F. W. *The First Epistle of Peter*. Oxford, 1961.
- Bellinzoni, A. J. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*. Suppl. Nov. Test. XVII. Leiden, 1967.
- Bentzen, A. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 2 vols., Copenhagen, 1949.
- Beyschlag, K. *Clemens Romanus und der Fröhhkatholizismus*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 35, Tübingen, 1966.
- Bigg, C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*. ICC. Edinburgh, 1901.
- Blackman, E. C. *Marcion and His Influence*. London, 1948.
- Bonsirven, J. *Exégèse Rabbiniqne et Exégèse Paulinienne*. Paris, 1939.
- Bousset, W. *Die Evangelienzeit Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik*. Göttingen, 1891.
- , *Jüdisch-Christlichen Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge, 6. Heft. Göttingen, 1915.
- Braun, F.-M. *Jean le Théologien et son Évangile dans l'Église Ancienne*. 2 vols. Paris, 1959.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids, 1960.
- , *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. London, 1963.
- , *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. London, 1964.
- Buhl, F. *Canon and Text of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. Macpherson. Edinburgh, 1892.
- Bultmann, R. *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*. Göttingen, 1910.
- Campanhausen, H. F. von. *Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. 1951.
- , *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 14. Tübingen, 1953.
- , *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 39. Tübingen, 1968.
- Carrington, P. *The Primitive Christian Catechism*. Cambridge, 1940.
- [Cassels, W. R.] *Supernatural Religion*. 3 vols., 4th ed. London, 1874.
- , *A Reply to Dr. Lightfoot's Essays*. London, 1889.
- Charles, R. H. *The Book of Enoch*. Oxford, 1893.
- , *The Assumption of Moses*. London, 1897.
- Clarke, W. K. L. *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*. London, 1937.
- Cullmann, O. *Early Christian Worship*. Studies in Biblical Theology 10. London, 1953.
- Daniélou, J. *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*. Bibliothèque de Théologie. Paris, 1958.
- , *From Shadows to Reality*. Translated by D. W. Hibberd. London, 1960.
- Daube, D. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London, 1956.

- Davies, W. D. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge, 1964.
- Dibelius, M. *Der Brief des Jakobus*. Meyer Kommentar. 7th ed. Göttingen, 1921.
- , *Die Apostolischen Väter. Der Hirt des Hermas*. HZNT, Ergänzungsband 4. Tübingen, 1923.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures*. London, 1952.
- , *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*. London, 1963.
- Donaldson, J. *The Apostolical Fathers*. London, 1874.
- Drews, P. *Untersuchungen über die sogen. clementinische Liturgie im VIII Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen*. 1. Die Clementinische Liturgie im Rom. Studien zur Geschichte des Gottesdienstes und des gottesdienstlichen Lebens, II u. III. Tübingen, 1906.
- Edmundson, G. *The Church in Rome in the First Century*. London, 1913.
- Eggenberger, C. *Die Quellen der politischen Ethik des 1. Klemensbriefes*. Zürich, 1951.
- Ehrhardt, A. *The Apostolic Succession*. London, 1953.
- Eissfeldt, O. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Translated by P. R. Ackroyd. Oxford, 1966.
- Ellis, E. E. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. London, 1957.
- Farrar, F. W. *History of Interpretation*. London, 1886.
- Flesseman-Van Leer, E. *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church*. Assen, 1953.
- Freed, E. D. *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*. Suppl. Nov. Test. XI. Leiden, 1965.
- Gerhardsson, B. *Memory and Manuscript*. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis XXII. Uppsala, 1961.
- , *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*. Coniectanea Neotestamentica XX. Lund, 1964.
- Gerke, Friedrich. *Die Stellung des ersten Clemensbriefes innerhalb der Entwicklung der altchristlichen Gemeindeverfassung und des Kirchenrechts*. TU 47, Leipzig, 1931.
- Goodspeed, E. J. *The Formation of the New Testament*. Chicago, 1926.
- , *New Solutions of New Testament Problems*. Chicago, 1927.
- , *The Meaning of Ephesians*. Chicago, 1933.
- , *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Chicago, 1937.
- , *Christianity Goes to Press*. New York, 1940.
- , *A History of Early Christian Literature*. Revised and enlarged by R. M. Grant (1st ed., 1942). Chicago, 1966.
- Goppelt, L. *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlichen Theologie. 2. Reihe, 55. Band. Gütersloh, 1954.
- Grant, R. M. *The Letter and the Spirit*. London, 1957.
- , *The Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction*. AF I, New York, 1964.
- , *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*. London, 1965. Formerly published as *The Bible in the Early Church*. New York, 1948.
- , *The Formation of the New Testament*. London, 1965.
- , *Ignatius of Antioch*. AF IV. Camden. N.J., 1966.
- Grant, R. M., and Graham, H. H. *First and Second Clement*. AF II, New York, 1965.
- Gregory, C. R. *Canon and Text of the New Testament*. Edinburgh, 1907.
- Griffiths, C. G. *The Unwritten Sayings of Christ*. London, 1903.
- Gundry, R. H. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*. Suppl. Nov. Test. XVIII. Leiden, 1967.
- Hanson, R. P. C. *Allegory and Event*. London, 1959.

- , *Tradition in the Early Church*. London, 1962.
- Harnack, A. *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*. I. *Die Überlieferung und der Bestand der Altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*. 2 vols., Leipzig, 1893-97.
II. *Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1904.
- , *The Sayings of Jesus*. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. London, 1908.
- , *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. Leipzig, 1921.
- , *The Origin of the New Testament*. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. London, 1925.
- , *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus*. Leipzig, 1926.
- , *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte: Das Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die korinthische aus der Zeit Domitians*. 1. *Clemensbrief*. Leipzig, 1929.
- Harris, J. R. *The Diatessaron of Tatian*. Cambridge, 1890.
- , *Testimonies*. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1916-1920.
- Harrison, P. N. *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*. Oxford, 1921.
- , *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*. Cambridge, 1936.
- Hatch, E. *Essays in Biblical Greek*. Oxford, 1889.
- Hölscher, G. *Kanonisch und Apokryph*. Naumburg a.S., 1905.
- Holtz, T. *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*. TU 104. Berlin, 1968.
- Hort, F. J. *Notes Introductory to the Study of the Clementine Recognitions*. London, 1901.
- Hunt, B. P. W. Stather. *Primitive Gospel Sources*. London, 1951.
- Hunter, A. M. *Paul and His Predecessors*. London, 1940.
- Jacquier, E. *Le Nouveau Testament dans l'Église Chrétienne*. 2 vols. Paris, 1911-13.
- James, R. M. *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament*. London, 1920.
- Jellicoe, S. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford, 1968.
- Jeremias, J. *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*. Translated by R. H. Fuller. 2nd ed. London, 1964.
- Johnson, F. *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old*. London, 1896.
- Kahle, P. *The Cairo Geniza*. 2nd. ed. Oxford, 1959.
- Katz, P. *Philo's Bible*. Cambridge, 1950.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 3rd ed. London, 1965.
- Kennedy, J. H. *The Second and Third Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. London, 1900.
- Kenyon, F. G. *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Oxford, 1932.
- Kistemaker, S. *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Amsterdam, 1961.
- Kleist, J. A. *The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch*. Ancient Christian Writers. Vol. I. Westminster, Maryland, 1946.
- Klevinghaus, J. *Die theologische Stellung der Apostolischen Väter zur alttestamentlichen Offenbarung*. Gütersloh, 1948.
- Knoch, O. *Eigenart und Bedeutung der Eschatologie im theologischen Aufriss des ersten Clemensbriefes*. Theophaneia, Beiträge zur Religions- und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums 17. Bonn, 1964.
- Knopf, R. *Die Apostolischen Väter. Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel. Die Zwei Clemensbriefe*. HZNT, Ergänzungsband 1. Tübingen, 1920.
- Knowling, R. J. *The Epistle of James*. London, 1904.
- Knox, J. *Philemon Among the Letters of Paul*. Chicago, 1935.
- , *Marcion and the New Testament*. Chicago, 1942.
- Köster, Helmut. *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*. TU 65. Berlin, 1957.

- Kraft, R. A. *Barnabas and the Didache. AF III*, New York, 1965.
- Krause, W. *Die Stellung der Frühchristlichen Autoren zur heidnischen Literatur*. Wien, 1958.
- Kümmel, W. G. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. London, 1966.
- Lake, K. *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*. London, 1927.
- Lampe, G. W. H., and Woolcombe, K. J. *Essays on Typology*. London, 1957.
- Lardner, Nathaniel. *The Credibility of the Gospel History*. Vol. II. London, 1847.
- Leipoldt, J. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Leipzig, 1907.
- Leonard, W. *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. London, 1939.
- Lietzmann, H. *An die Korinther I/II*. HZNT 9. Tübingen, 1949.
- , *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*. Translated by B. L. Woolf. London, 1949.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*. London, 1873.
- , *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. London, 1874.
- , *Biblical Essays*. London, 1893.
- , *Essays on the Work Entitled Supernatural Religion*. London, 1893.
- , *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*. London, 1895.
- Loewenich, W. von *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des ältesten Kirche 13. Giessen, 1932.
- Manson, T. W. *The Sayings of Jesus*. London, 1949.
- Massaux, Edouard, *Influence de l'Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*. Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis Series II. Tomus 42. Louvain, 1950.
- Mayor, J. B. *The Epistle of St. James*. 3rd ed. London, 1910.
- Mees, M. *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien*. Quaderin di "Vetera Christianorum" 2. Bari, 1970.
- Metzger, B. M. *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York, 1957.
- , *The Text of the New Testament*. London, 1964.
- Meyer, A. *Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der ältesten Kirche 10. Giessen, 1930.
- Michel, O. *Paulus und seine Bibel*. Gütersloh, 1929.
- Mitton, C. L. *The Epistle of the Ephesians*. Oxford, 1951.
- , *The Formation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters*. London, 1955.
- Moffatt, J. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. Edinburgh, 1911.
- Moore, G. F. *Judaism*. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1927-1930.
- Montgomery, J. A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. ICC. Edinburgh, 1927.
- Moule, C. F. D. *The Birth of the New Testament*. New York, 1962.
- Nairne, A. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. CGT. Cambridge, 1917.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*. Oxford, 1925.
- , *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha*. London, 1935.
- Oxford Society of Historical Theology. *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford, 1905.
- Pfeiffer, R. H. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York, 1941.
- , *History of New Testament Times*. London, 1949.
- Prigent, P. *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme Primitif: L'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses Sources*. Paris, 1961.

- , *Justin et L'Ancien Testament*. Paris, 1964.
- Rahlfs, A. *Septuaginta-Studien*. 1. Heft, *Studien zu den Königsbüchern*. Göttingen, 1904. 2. Heft, *Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalter*. Göttingen, 1907. 3. Heft, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher*. Göttingen, 1911.
- Rathke, H. *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbriefe*. TU 99. Berlin, 1967.
- Rendall, G. H. *The Epistle of James and Judaic Christianity*. Cambridge, 1927.
- Resch, A. *Agrapha*¹. *Aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente*. 1st ed. TU 5. Leipzig, 1889.
- , *Agrapha*². *Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente*. 2nd ed. TU 30. Leipzig, 1906.
- , *Die Logia Jesu*. Leipzig, 1898.
- , *Der Paulinismus und Die Logia Jesu*. TU 27. Leipzig, 1904.
- Richardson, C. C., et al. *Early Christian Fathers*. LCC. Vol. I. London, 1953.
- Riesenfeld, H. *The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings*. TU 73. Berlin, 1959.
- Roberts, A., and Donaldson, J. *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*. AF I. Edinburgh, 1873.
- Roberts, B. J. *The Old Testament Text and Versions*. Cardiff, 1951.
- Ropes, J. H. *Die Sprüche Jesu*. TU 14. Leipzig, 1896.
- , *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*. ICC. Edinburgh, 1916.
- Rowley, H. H. *The Growth of the Old Testament*. New York, 1963 reprint.
- Ryle, H. E. *The Canon of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. London, 1904.
- Sanday, W. *The Gospels in the Second Century*. London, 1876.
- , *Inspiration*. London, 1894.
- Sanders, L. *L'Hellénisme de Saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme*. Lovanii, 1943.
- Schoedel, W. R. *Polycarp, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Fragments of Papias*. AF V. Camden. N. J., 1967.
- Seeberg, D. A. *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*. Leipzig, 1903.
- Selwyn, E. G. *The First Epistle of St. Peter*. London, 1946.
- Smith, W. Robertson. *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*. London, 1892.
- Snyder, G. F. *The Shepherd of Hermas*. AF VI. Camden, N. J., 1968.
- Souter, A. *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. London, 1913.
- Spitta, F. *Der Brief des Jakobus*. Göttingen, 1896.
- Stählin, O. *Clemens Alexandrinus und die Septuaginta*. Nürnberg, 1901.
- Stanton, V. H. *The Gospels as Historical Documents*. 3 vols. Cambridge, 1903-1920.
- Stendahl, K. *The School of St. Matthew*. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis XX. Uppsala, 1954.
- Stonehouse, N. B. *The Apocalypse in the Ancient Church*. Goes, n.d.
- Strack, H. L., and Billerbeck, P. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. I-IV/2. München, 1922-28.
- Streeter, B. H. *The Four Gospels*. London, 1924.
- , *The Primitive Church*. London, 1930.
- Sundberg, A. C., Jr. *The Old Testament of the Early Church*. Harvard Theological Studies XX. Cambridge, Mass., 1964.
- Swete, H. B. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge, 1902.
- Taylor, C. *The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels*. London, 1892.
- Taylor, V. *The Text of the New Testament*. London, 1961.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge, 1909.
- Thyen, H. *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Neue Folge, 47. Heft. Göttingen, 1955.
- Torrance, T. F. *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edinburgh, 1948.

- Torrey, C. C. *The Apocryphal Literature*. New Haven, 1945.
- Turner, C. H. *Studies in Early Church History*. Oxford, 1912.
- Turpie, D. M. *The Old Testament in the New*. London, 1868.
- , *The New Testament View of the Old*. London, 1872.
- Vollmer, H. *Die alttestamentlichen Citate bei Paulus*. Leipzig, 1895.
- Wendland, P. *Die urchristliche Literaturformen*. HZNT I, Tübingen, 1912.
- Westcott, B. F. *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*. London, 1896.
- Wilcox, W. *The Semitisms of Acts*. Oxford, 1965.
- Williams, A. Lukyn. *Adversus Judaeos*. Cambridge, 1935.
- Windisch, H. *Die Apostolischen Väter. Der Barnabasbrief*. HZNT, Ergänzungsband 3. Tübingen, 1920.
- Wood J. D. *The Interpretation of the Bible*. London, 1958.
- Wrede, W. *Untersuchungen zum Ersten Klemensbriefe*. Göttingen, 1891.
- Wright, L. E. *Alterations of the Words of Jesus*. Harvard Historical Monographs XXV. Cambridge, Mass., 1952.
- Zahn, T. *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur I-X*. Erlangen, 1881-1929.
- , *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*. 2 vols. Erlangen, 1888-1892.
- , *Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Leipzig, 1901.
- Ziegler, A. W. *Neue Studien zum ersten Klemensbrief*. München, 1958.
- Zuntz, G. *The Text of the Epistles*. London, 1953.

IV. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Foster, Lewis A. "Clement of Rome and His Literary Sources", Harvard University Ph. D. Thesis. 1957-1958.
- Kraft, R. A. "The Epistle of Barnabas, Its Quotations and their Sources", Harvard University Ph. D. Thesis. 1961.
- Thomas, K. J. "The Use of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews", University of Manchester Ph. D. Thesis. 1959.
- Wragg, Joan. "St. Luke's Nativity Narrative, with Special Reference to the Canticles in the Light of Jewish and Early Christian Background", University of Manchester Ph. D. Thesis. 1965.

V. ARTICLES

- Alexander, J. N. S. "The Interpretation of Scripture in the Ante-Nicene Period", *Interpretation* 12 (1958), 272-280.
- Allegro, J. M. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", *JBL* 75 (1956), 174-187.
- , "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrašim", *JBL* 77 (1958), 350-354.
- Anderson, C. P. "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline Letter Collection", *HTR* 59 (1966), 429-438.

- Anderson, G. W. "Canonical and Non-Canonical", *CHB* I. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge, 1970), 113-159.
- Andrews, H. T. "Professor Rendel Harris and the Urevangelium", *Expository Times* 9 (1897-98), 94-95.
- Atkinson, B. F. C. "The Textual Background of the Use of the Old Testament by the New", *Journal of Transactions of the Victoria Institute* 79 (1947), 39-60.
- Audet, J.-P. "L'Hypothèse des Testimonia", *RB* 70 (1963), 381-405.
- Bacon, B. W. "The Doctrine of Faith in Hebrews, James and Clement of Rome", *JBL* 19 (1900), 12-21.
- Bakhuizen van den Brink, J. N. "Tradition and Authority in the Early Church", *Studia Patristica* VII. Edited by F. L. Cross, TU 92 (Berlin, 1966), 3-22.
- Barnard, L. W. "The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr", *VT* 14 (1964), 395-406.
- , "The Testimonium Concerning the Stone in the New Testament and in the Epistle of Barnabas", *Studia Evangelica* III. TU 88 (Berlin, 1964), 306-313.
- , "The Early Roman Church, Judaism, and Jewish-Christianity", *Anglican Theological Review* 49 (1967), 371-384.
- , "Justin Martyr in Recent Study", *SJT* 22 (1969), 152-164.
- Barthélemy, D. "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante", *RB* 60 (1953), 18-29.
- Bartlet, J. V. "Fragments of the *Didascalia Apostolorum* in Greek", *JTS* 18 (1916-17), 301-309.
- Bartsch, H.-W. "Das Thomas-Evangelium und die Synoptischen Evangelien", *NTS* 6 (1959-60), 249-261.
- , "Rom. 9,5 und 1. Clem. 34,4", *ThZ* 21 (1965), 401-409.
- Boismard, R. P. "Clément de Rome et l'Évangile de Jean", *RB* 55 (1948), 376-387.
- , "Critique Textuelle et Citations Patristique", *RB* 57 (1950), 388-408.
- Brown, J. P. "The Form of 'Q' Known to Matthew", *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 27-42.
- Bruce, F. F. "Qumrân and Early Christianity", *NTS* 2 (1955-56), 176-190.
- , "The Epistles of Paul", *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*. Edited by M. Black and H. H. Rowley. (London, 1962), pp. 927-937.
- Buck, C. H., Jr. "The Early Order of the Pauline Corpus", *JBL* 68 (1949), 351-357.
- Capelle, D. B. "La 1^a Clementis et L'épître de Polycarpe", *Revue Bénédictine* 37 (1925), 283-287.
- Carlyle, A. J. "Clement of Rome", *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by the Oxford Society of Historical Theology. (Oxford, 1905), pp. 37-62.
- Carroll, K. L. "The Expansion of the Pauline Corpus", *JBL* 72 (1953), 230-237.
- , "The Creation of the Fourfold Gospel", *BJRL* 37 (1954-55), 68-77.
- , "The Earliest New Testament", *BJRL* 38 (1955-56), 45-57.
- Cerfaux, L. "Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre des Acts", *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne*. Mélanges offerts à M. Goguel. (Neuchâtel, 1950), pp. 43-51.
- Crehan, J. H. "The Fourfold Character of the Gospel", *Studia Evangelica* I. Edited by K. Aland, F. L. Cross, et al. TU 73 (Berlin, 1959), 3-13.
- Cullmann, O. "The Plurality of the Gospels as a Theological Problem in Antiquity", translated by Stanley Godman. *The Early Church*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. (London, 1966), pp. 39-54. [= "Die Pluralität der Evangelien als theologisches Problem im Altertum", *TZ* 1 (1945), 23-42.

- Dahl, N. A. "The Particularity of the Pauline Epistles as a Problem in the Ancient Church", *Neotestamentica et Patristica*. Cullmann Festschrift. Suppl. Nov. Test. VI (Leiden, 1962), 261-271.
- Daniélou, Jean. "The Fathers and the Scriptures", *Theology* 57 (1954), 83-89.
- Dodd, C. H. "The 'Primitive Catechism' and the Sayings of Jesus", *More New Testament Studies*. (Manchester, 1968).
- Dressler, H. "Clement I, Pope, St.", *New Catholic Encyclopedia* III (New York, 1967), pp. 926-928.
- Feuillet, A. "L'Énigme de 1 Cor., II, 9", *RB* 70 (1963), 52-74.
- Finegan, J. "The Original Form of the Pauline Collection", *HTR* 49 (1956), 85-103.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. "'4Q' Testimonia and the New Testament", *Theological Studies* 18 (1957), 513-537.
- Flesseman-Van Leer, Ellen. "Prinzipien der Sammlung und Ausscheidung bei der Bildung des Kanons", *ZTK* 61 (1964), 404-420.
- Fritsch, C. T. "Apocrypha", *IDB* I, pp. 161-166.
- Funk, F. X. "Die syrische Übersetzung der Klemensbriefe", *Theologische Quartalschrift* 59 (1877), 477-498.
- Gehman, H. S. "Septuagint", *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* II (Grand Rapids, 1955), pp. 1015-17.
- Glover, R. "The Didache's Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels", *NTS* 5 (1958-59), 12-29.
- Goodspeed, E. J. "First Clement Called Forth by Hebrews", *JBL* 30 (1911), 157-160.
- , "Ephesians and the First Edition of Paul", *JBL* 70 (1951), 285-291.
- Grant, R. M. "Clement of Rome", *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* I (Grand Rapids, 1955), pp. 264-265.
- , "The New Testament Canon", *CHB* I. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans. (Cambridge, 1970), 284-308.
- Greig, J. C. G. "Gospel Messianism and Qumran Use of Prophecy", *Studia Evangelica* I. TU 73 (Berlin, 1959), 593-599.
- Hall, S. G. "Repentance in I Clement", *Studia Patristica* VIII. Edited by F. L. Cross. TU 93 (Berlin, 1966), 30-43.
- Hanson, R. P. C. "St. Paul's Quotations of the Book of Job", *Theology* 53 (1950), 250-253.
- Harnack, A. "Über die jüngst entdeckte lateinische Übersetzung des ersten Klemensbriefes", *Sitzungsberichte der königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*. Jahrgang 1894, 261-273.
- , "Neue Studien zur jüngst entdeckten lateinischen Übersetzung des ersten Klemensbriefes", *Sitzungsberichte der königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*. Jahrgang 1894, 601-621.
- , "Die ältesten Evangelien-Prologe und die Bildung des Neuen Testaments", *Sitzungsberichte der königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Jahrgang 1928
- Harris, J. R. "The 'Logia' and the Gospels", *The Contemporary Review* 72 (1897), 341-348.
- , "On an Obscure Quotation in the First Epistle of Clement", *JBL* 29 (1910), 190-195.
- Harrop, G. G. "Some Negative Thinking on the Question of Peter's Roman Residence and Martyrdom", *Canadian Journal of Theology* 2 (1956), 76-84.
- Heard, R. "Papias' Quotations from the New Testament", *NTS* 1 (1954-55), 130-134
- Hilgenfeld, A. "Die Briefe des römischen Klemens und ihre syrische Übersetzung", *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 20 (1877), 549-562.

- James, M. R. "The New Sayings of Christ", *The Contemporary Review* 72 (1897), 153-160.
- , "The Apocryphal Ezekiel", *JTS* 15 (1914), 236-243.
- Jaubert, A. "Les Sources de la Conception Militaire de l'Église en 1 Clément 37", *VC* 18 (1964), 74-84.
- Jepsen, A. "Zur Kanongeschichte des Alten Testaments", *ZAW* 71 (1959), 114-136.
- Jeremias, J. "Zur Hypothese einer schriftlichen Logienquelle Q", *ZNTW* 29 (1930), 147-149.
- Kahle, P. "Die Septuaginta : Prinzipielle Erwägungen", *Festschrift Otto Eissfeldt zum 60. Geburtstag*. Edited by J. Fünk. (Halle, 1947), 161-180.
- , "Problems of the Septuagint", *Studia Patristica* I. TU 63 (Berlin, 1957), 328-338.
- Katz, P. "Das Problem des Urtextes des Septuaginta", *ThZ* 5 (1949), 1-24.
- , "The Recovery of the Original Septuagint, A Study in the History of Transmission and Textual Criticism", *Actes du premier Congrès de la Fédération internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques*. (Paris, 1951), 165-182.
- , "The Old Testament in Palestine and Alexandria", *ZNTW* 47 (1956), 191-217.
- , "Septuagintal Studies in the Mid-Century", *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. (Cambridge, 1956), 176-208.
- , "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll", *Studia Patristica* I. TU 63 (Berlin, 1957), 343-353.
- Kittel, G. "Der Jakobusbrief und die Apostolischen Väter", *ZNTW* 43 (1950-51), 54-112.
- Köster, H. "Die ausserkanonischen Herrenworte als Produkte der christlichen Gemeinde", *ZNTW* 48 (1957), 220-237.
- Kraft, R. "Barnabas' Isaiah Text and the 'Testimony Book' Hypothesis", *JBL* 79 (1960), 336-350.
- Kümmel, W. G. "Schriftauslegung im Urchristentum", *RGK³* V, 1518f.
- Lake, K. "The New Sayings of Jesus and the Synoptic Problem", *HJ* 3 (1904-05), 332-341.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "Typological Exegesis", *Theology* 56 (1963), 201-208.
- , "The Exposition and Exegesis of Scripture. 1. To Gregory the Great", *The Cambridge History of the Bible* II. Edited by G. W. H. Lampe. (Cambridge, 1969), 155-183.
- Lemarchand, L. "La Composition de l'Épître de Saint Clément aux Corinthiens", *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 18 (1938), 448-457.
- Lietzmann, H. "Zwei Notizen zu Paulus, 1. Der Anfang der ersten Korintherbriefes", *Kleine Schriften*. Edited by K. Aland. TU 68 (Berlin, 1958), 284-287.
- Linton, O. "Interpretation of the Psalms in the Early Church", *Studia Patristica* IV. TU 79 (Berlin, 1961), 143-156.
- Lohse, E. "Paränese und Kerygma im 1. Petrusbrief", *ZNTW* 45 (1954), 68-89.
- Manson, T. W. "The Argument from Prophecy", *JTS* 46 (1945), 129-136.
- , "The Life of Jesus : A Survey of the Available Material : (4) The Gospel According to St. Matthew", *BJRL* 29 (1945-46), 392-428.
- Marsh, F. S. "Clement of Rome", *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*. 2nd ed. I (1926), 216-220.
- Marshall, J. T. "Eldad and Modad, Book of", *HDB* I, 676.
- McCown, C. H. "Codex and Roll in the New Testament", *HTR* 34 (1941), 219-250.
- Meinhold, P. "Geschehen und Deutung im Ersten Clemensbrief", *ZKG* 58 (1939), 82-129.
- Metzger, B. M. "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the New Testament and the Mishna", *JBL* 70 (1951), 297-307.

- , "The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible", *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*. (Leiden, 1963), pp. 1-41.
- Milburn, R. L. P. "The Persecution of Domitian", *Church Quarterly Review* 139 (1945), 154-164.
- Mohrmann, C. "Les Origines de la Latinité Chrétienne à Rome", *VC* 3 (1949), 67-106; 163-183.
- Mowry, L. "The Early Circulation of Paul's Letters", *JBL* 63 (1944), 73-86.
- Nestle, E. "Septuagint", *HDB* IV, 437-454.
- , "War der Verfasser der ersten Clemens-Briefes semitischen Abstammung?" *ZNTW* 1 (1900), 178-180.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Exegesis of the Old Testament", *Record and Revelation*. Edited by H. W. Robinson. (Oxford, 1938), 403-426.
- Orlinsky, H. M. "On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 61 (1941), 81-91.
- , "Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research", *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*. Edited by H. R. Willoughby. (Chicago, 1947), 144-161.
- Petrie, Stewart. "'Q' Is Only What You Make It", *Nov. Test.* 3 (1959), 28-33.
- Pfeiffer, R. H. "Canon of the Old Testament", *IDB* I, 498-520.
- Praetorius, G. "Die Bedeutung der beiden Klemensbriefe für die älteste Geschichte der kirchlichen Praxis", *ZK* 33 (1912), 347-363; 501-528.
- Prigent, P. "Ce que l'œil n'a pas vu, 1 Cor. 2.9", *ThZ* 14 (1958), 416-429.
- Quispel, G. "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament", *VC* 11 (1957), 189-207.
- Rahlfs, A. "History of the Septuagint Text", *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart, 1935), xxii-xxxi.
- Roberts, B. J. "The Old Testament: Manuscripts, Texts, and Versions", *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Edited by G. W. H. Lampe. (Cambridge, 1969), 1-26.
- Roberts, C. H. "An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library", *BJRL* 20 (1936), 45-55.
- , "The Christian Book and the Greek Papyri", *JTS* 50 (1949), 155-168.
- , "The Codex", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 40 (1954), 169-204.
- , "Books in the Graeco-Roman World and in the New Testament", *CHB* I. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans. (Cambridge, 1970), 48-66.
- Sagnard, F. M. M. "Holy Scripture in the Early Fathers of the Church", *Studia Evangelica* I. TU 73 (Berlin, 1959), 706-713.
- Sanday, W. "A Survey of the Synoptic Question: New Hypotheses", *The Expositor*. Fourth Series 3 (1891), 345-361; 411-426.
- Sanders, H. A. "The Beginnings of the Modern Book", *University of Michigan Quarterly Review* (1938).
- Schmithals, W. "Zur Abfassung und ältesten Sammlung der paulinischen Hauptbriefe", *ZNTW* 51 (1960), 225-245.
- Schweitzer, V. "Glaube und Werke bei Klemens Romanus", *Theologische Quartalschrift* 85 (1903), 417-437; 547-575.
- Seitz, O. J. F. "Relationship of the Shepherd of Hermas to the Epistle of James", *JBL* 63 (1944), 131-140.
- , "Antecedents and Signification of the Term $\delta\psi\psi\chi\omicron\varsigma$ ", *JBL* 66 (1947), 211-219.
- , "Afterthoughts on the Term 'Dipsychos'" *NTS* 4 (1957-58), 327-334.
- Shepherd, M. H. "The Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew", *JBL* 75 (1956), 40-51.
- Skeat, T. C. "Early Christian Book-Production: Papyri and Manuscripts", *The Cam-*

- bridge History of the Bible* II. Edited by G. W. H. Lampe. (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 54-79.
- Smith, Morton. "The Report About Peter in 1 Clement 5.4," *NTS* 7 (1960-61), 86-88.
- Sperber, A. "The Problems of the Septuagint Recensions" *JBL* 54 (1935), 73-92.
- , "New Testament and Septuagint", *JBL* 59 (1940), 193-293.
- Suggs, M. J. "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text", *NTS* 4 (1957-58), 139-147.
- Sundberg, A. C., Jr. "On Testimonies", *Nov. Test.* 3 (1959), 268-281.
- , "The Protestant Old Testament Canon: Should It Be Re-examined?" *CBQ* 28 (1966), 194-203.
- , "Towards a Revised History of the New Testament Canon", *Studia Evangelica* IV. TU 102 (Berlin, 1968), 452-461.
- Tarelli, C. C. "Clement of Rome and the Fourth Gospel", *JTS* 48 (1947), 208-209.
- Unnik, W. C. van "Is 1 Clement 20 Purely Stoic?" *VC* 4 (1950), 181-189.
- , "1 Clement 34 and the 'Sanctus' ", *VC* 5 (1951), 204-248.
- , "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament", *The Jung Codex*. Edited by F. L. Cross. (London, 1955), 79-129.
- , "«*Ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη*» — a Problem in the Early History of the Canon", *Studia Patristica* IV. TU 79 (Berlin, 1961), 212-227.
- Venard, L. "Citations de l'Ancien Testament dans le Nouveau Testament", *Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément* II. Columns 23-51.
- Vokes, F. E. "The Didache and the Canon of the New Testament", *Studia Evangelica* III. TU 88 (Berlin, 1964), 427-436.
- Völter, D. "Petrus-evangelium oder Ägypter-evangelium?" *ZNTW* 6 (1905), 368-372.
- Werner, E. "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis", *Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume* II. (Jerusalem, 1965), 793-818.
- Wevers, J. W. "Septuagint", *IDB* IV, 273-278.
- Woods, F. H. "Quotations", *HDB* IV, 184-188.
- Young, F. W. "The Relationship of 1 Clement to the Epistle of James", *JBL* 67 (1948), 339-345.
- Ziegler, K. "Plagiat", *Real Encyclopädie Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Pauly-Wissowa, XX, columns 1956-1997.

AUTHOR INDEX

- Ackroyd, P. R. 105, 112, 216
 Aland, K. 205, 331, 333
 Allegro, J. M. 96, 97
 Anderson, A. A. 96
 Anderson, C. P. 326
 Anderson, G. W. 113, 115
 Andrews, H. T. 141
 Armstrong, G. T. 127
 Arndt, W. F. 244, 248
 Atkinson, B. F. C. 34
 Audet, J.-P. 95, 97, 102, 104, 274

 Bacon, B. W. 94, 251
 Bakhuizen van den Brink, J. N. 340
 Bakhuyzen van de Sande, W. H. 158
 Bardy, G. 125
 Barnard, L. W. 4, 5, 7, 95, 103
 Barnard, P. M. 140, 154
 Barnett, A. E. 204, 208, 210, 223, 230, 278, 284, 285, 286
 Barnikol, E. 178
 Barrett, C. K. 207
 Barthélemy, D. 82
 Bartlet, J. V. 143
 Bartsch, H.-W. 216, 296, 312
 Bauer, W. 142, 244, 248, 268, 274, 315, 320, 321
 Beare, F. W. 242, 246, 310
 Bell, H. I. 298
 Bellinzoni, A. J. 283, 302
 Bensly, R. L. 10
 Bentzen, A. 114
 Beyer, H. W. 231, 313
 Beyschlag, K. 7, 16, 65, 69, 127, 148, 162, 194, 210, 238, 258, 263, 308f., 311
 Bigg, C. 238, 244, 246, 248, 278
 Billerbeck, P. 109, 110, 113, 127, 165, 168, 207
 Birdsall, J. N. 216
 Blackman, E. C. 341, 342, 344, 347
 Boismard, R. P. 264, 265, 266, 289
 Bonsirven, J. 292
 Bousset, W. 283, 295, 301, 308
 Braun, F.-M. 264, 265, 267, 269, 342
 Brooke, A. E. 77, 270
 Brown, J. P. 294f.
 Bruce, F. F. 96, 187, 256, 258, 261, 315
 Bryennios, Ph. 9, 147
 Buck, C. H. Jr., 328, 334
 Buhl, F. 113, 114
 Bultmann, R. 139, 266, 308
 Burkitt, F. C. 94, 96

 Calvin, J. 254
 Campenhausen, H. F. von 127, 128, 131, 231, 330, 334-339 (passim), 345, 346, 347
 Carlyle, A. J. 235
 Carrington, P. 238, 305, 306, 309, 310
 Carroll, K. L. 323f., 334f., 347
 Cassels, W. R. 143, 149, 160
 Cerfaux, L. 260
 Chadwick, H. M. and N. K. 104
 Charles, R. H. 88, 89, 157
 Clark, D. L. 104
 Clarke, W. K. L. 148, 161, 185, 203, 208, 230, 241, 246, 349
 Connolly, R. H. 143, 144, 146
 Cotelier, J. B. 57, 160
 Coustant, P. 160
 Credner, K. A. 302
 Crehan, J. H. 333, 334
 Cross, F. L. 333, 348
 Cullmann, O. 170, 333f., 339

 Dahl, N. A. 330
 Daniélou, J. 7, 59, 64, 66, 67, 74, 75, 86, 127, 129, 130
 Daube, D. 82, 305
 Davies, W. D. 82, 205, 304
 Dibelius, M. 238, 249, 250, 252, 254, 308, 309
 Dodd, C. H. 94, 97, 122, 124, 181, 267, 306
 Donaldson, J. 73, 117, 148, 161, 349
 Dressler, H. 7
 Drews, P. 170, 186, 194, 205, 308

- Duchesne, L. 170
 Dugmore, C. W. 125
- Edmundson, G. 5
 Eggenberger, C. 107
 Ehrhardt, A. 3, 339
 Eissfeldt, O. 112, 113, 114
 Elliot-Binns, L. E. 5
 Ellis, E. E. 30, 31, 34, 82, 93, 204, 207
 Evans, C. F. 105, 216
- Falconer, R. 230, 231
 Farrar, F. W. 125, 130
 Feuillet, A. 207
 Field, F. 66
 Finegan, J. 328
 Fitzmyer, J. A. 93, 96
 Flesseman-Van Leer, E. 125, 320, 338, 339, 342, 345, 348
 Foster, L. A. 14, 35, 41, 171, 244
 Freed, E. D. 34
 Friedrich, G. 333
 Fritsch, C. T. 113
 Fuller, R. H. 259, 342
 Funk, F. X. 12, 143, 144, 147, 160
- Gebhardt, O. 16, 17, 58, 65, 66, 67, 70, 75, 147, 160
 Gerhardsson, B. 104, 105, 151, 292, 303f., 305, 306
 Gingrich, F. W. 244, 248
 Glover, R. 280
 Godman, S. 334
 Goguel, M. 260
 Goodspeed, E. J. 148, 161, 194, 195, 313, 316ff., 320, 321, 323, 325, 327f., 333, 334
 Goppelt, L. 127
 Grant, R. M. 8, 17, 25, 29, 32, 39, 41, 44, 51, 52, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61-65 (passim) 67, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 95, 99ff., 103, 117, 122, 125, 126, 140, 142, 148, 161, 162, 164, 175, 186, 191, 202, 204, 205, 208, 209, 226, 235, 249, 257, 261, 267, 275, 276, 277, 279, 280, 283, 286, 300, 320, 330, 331, 343, 344, 346, 348, 349
 Gregory, C. R. 288, 321
 Grenfell, B. P. 296
 Griffinhoofe, C. G. 148
- Gundry, R. H. 34, 82, 95, 176
 Guthrie, D. 213, 325
- Haenchen, E. 261
 Hanson, R. P. C. 24, 123, 129, 130, 304, 305, 346, 347, 349
 Harnack, A. 1, 2, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 22, 44, 49, 58, 60, 65, 66, 67, 70, 73, 74, 75, 91, 103, 105, 107, 111, 117, 121, 122, 128, 131, 143, 147, 149, 157, 160, 161, 162, 250, 265, 295, 296, 301, 319, 321, 322, 324, 325, 329, 333, 334, 335, 337, 345, 347
 Harris, J. R. 72, 93ff., 96, 97, 103, 140, 141, 181, 302
 Harrison, P. N. 141, 142, 150, 230, 231, 236, 246, 277, 278, 280, 319, 321
 Hatch, E. 34, 39, 40, 41, 43, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 67, 95, 96, 98ff., 172
 Heard, R. 342
 Hennecke, E. 296, 298, 300, 301, 313, 334
 Higgins, A. J. B. 334
 Hilgenfeld, A. 12, 66, 73, 88, 89, 148
 Holmes, R. 38, 77, 85, 172
 Hölscher, G. 115
 Holtz, T. 34
 Holtzmann, H. J. 256
 Hort, F. J. A. 2, 238
 Hunt, A. S. 296
 Hunt, B. P. W. Stather 94, 95, 96
 Hunter, A. M. 305, 306, 310
- Jacquier, E. 140, 148, 160, 208, 276
 James, J. D. 230
 James, M. R. 71, 74, 76, 87, 91
 Jaubert, A. 202
 Jellicoe, S. 78, 82, 83
 Jepsen, A. 119
 Jeremias, J. 259, 293, 295, 297, 312, 334
 Johnson, F. 34
- Kahle, P. 81ff., 86
 Katz, P. 77, 82, 114
 Kelly, J. N. D. 109, 110, 115, 125, 236
 Kennedy, J. H. 210, 211, 212, 213
 Kennett, R. H. 10
 Kenyon, F. G. 9, 325
 Kistemaker, S. 34

- Kittel, G. 256
 Klevinghaus, J. 123
 Knoch, O. 59, 61, 67, 74, 103, 107, 148, 160, 173, 178, 194, 198, 201, 213, 221, 235, 238, 241, 242, 243, 246, 249-253 (passim), 248, 261, 268, 308, 341, 346, 347
 Knopf, R. 11, 13, 17, 42, 44, 49, 50, 52, 53, 57, 58, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 73, 74, 75, 77, 117, 123, 142, 148, 161, 165, 167, 173, 186, 190, 191, 204, 208, 209, 214, 215, 221, 308, 330, 339
 Knowling, R. J. 252
 Knox, J. 143, 213, 315, 318, 327f., 333, 335, 345
 Köster, H. 139, 141, 142, 143, 148, 155, 161, 162, 165, 166, 168, 170, 173, 174, 274, 275, 278-282 (passim), 297, 300, 302, 306, 332
 Kraft, R. A. 24, 31, 35, 95, 103, 130, 275, 280, 281
 Krause, W. 35
 Kroymann, A. 157
 Kümmel, W. G. 107, 131, 238, 249, 315, 336, 339, 345

 Lagarde, P. de 81, 143, 240
 Lake, K. 1, 117, 186, 219, 297, 318
 Lake, S. 318
 Lampe, G. W. H. 82, 128, 129, 130, 131, 314, 333
 Lardner, N. 160
 Lemarchand, L. 308
 Leipoldt, J. 338
 Leonard, W. 31
 Lietzmann, H. 170, 198, 331
 Lightfoot, J. B. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17, 22, 23, 39, 41-50 (passim), 52, 57, 58, 61, 63-67 (passim), 71-76 (passim), 85-89 (passim), 99, 117, 140, 142, 144, 147, 154, 158, 160, 164, 165, 166, 168, 170, 171, 174, 175, 180, 183, 184, 186, 188-193 (passim), 199, 202, 204, 207, 208, 209, 211, 217, 219, 221, 222, 228, 229, 232, 235, 237, 239, 247, 249, 250, 251, 253, 259, 268, 292, 300, 301, 320, 323, 330, 337, 349
 Linton, O. 126
 Lohse, E. 246, 309
 Lucar, C. 8
 Macpherson, J. 113
 Manson, T. W. 94, 290, 295
 Margolis, M. L. 82
 Marsh, J. 139
 Marshall, J. T. 87
 Massaux, E. 139, 143, 147, 150, 155, 160, 164, 166, 167, 168f., 173f., 182, 191, 192, 196, 204, 205, 209, 217, 221, 262, 278, 283, 295
 Mayor, J. B. 167, 238, 246, 254
 McClure, M. L. 170
 McCown, C. C. 290
 McLean, N. 77
 Mees, M. 172, 206
 Meinhold, M. 129
 Metzger, B. M. 30, 81, 83, 119, 205, 314
 Meyer, A. 238, 252, 256
 Michel, O. 30, 31, 84, 96, 103, 126
 Migne, J. P. 86, 144, 160
 Milburn, R. L. P. 4
 Mitton, C. L. 226, 310, 316
 Moffatt, J. 236, 241, 250, 254
 Mohl, J. 9
 Mohrmann, C. 10
 Montgomery, J. A. 62, 82, 86
 Moore, G. F. 103, 105, 114, 128
 Morin, G. 10, 12
 Moule, C. F. D. 318, 336
 Mowry, L. 317f.

 Nairne, A. 182, 183, 190, 192, 194
 Nestle, E. 56, 73, 80
 Nineham, D. E. 125

 Oesterley, W. O. E. 105, 117, 119, 130, 170
 Orlinsky, H. M. 82
 Oxford Committee 14, 16, 148, 161, 181, 202, 204, 205, 206, 216, 221, 226, 235, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244, 275, 278, 280, 300, 302

 Parsons, J. 38, 77, 85, 172
 Pauly, A. F. von 290
 Peterson, E. 215

- Petrie, S. 295
 Pfeiffer, R. H. 83, 113, 114
 Plummer, A. 207
 Prigent, P. 93, 95, 97, 99, 102, 104, 207
 Puech, H.-Ch. 301

 Quispel, G. 296, 302

 Rahlfs, A. 38, 42, 43, 45, 69, 75, 78, 81, 82, 84
 Rathke, H. 283
 Reitzenstein, R. 11, 211
 Rendall, G. H. 21
 Resch, A. 87-92 (*passim*), 139, 140, 143, 144, 145f., 148, 160, 165, 167, 205, 206, 240, 241f., 258, 294, 296
 Richardson, C. C. 148, 161
 Riesenfeld, H. 151, 303
 Roberts, B. J. 82, 83
 Roberts, C. H. 105, 290, 305, 313, 334
 Robertson, A. 207
 Ropes, J. H. 90, 145f., 206, 238, 240, 241, 242, 249, 253, 254, 309
 Rösch, F. 11, 13
 Rowley, H. H. 114
 Ryle, H. E. 113, 114, 116

 Sanday, W. 14, 15, 34, 35, 37, 108, 109, 143, 148, 149, 161, 174, 278, 292, 302, 305, 306, 321, 336, 339, 341, 345, 347
 Sanders, H. A. 313
 Sanders, L. 7, 178, 192, 198, 200, 201, 215, 330
 Schmidt, C. 11, 13
 Schmithals, W. 322ff.
 Schneemelcher, W. 296, 298, 300, 301, 313, 334
 Schoedel, W. R. 274, 320
 Schrenk, G. 110, 112, 118, 338
 Schweitzer, V. 249
 Seeberg, D. A. 306, 309
 Seitz, O. J. F. 253
 Selwyn, E. G. 238, 241, 242, 306, 309, 310
 Shepherd, M. H. 167
 Skeat, T. C. 298, 314
 Smith, M. 257, 258
 Snyder, G. F. 25
 Souter, A. 235, 288

 Sperber, A. 81, 82
 Spiegelberg, W. 11
 Spitta, F. 238, 242, 249, 250, 254, 255, 256
 Stählin, O. 11, 42, 43, 71, 76, 77, 78, 155, 172
 Stanton, V. H. 105, 106, 147, 160, 290, 307
 Stendahl, K. 34, 82, 95, 103, 106, 107, 291
 Stonehouse, N. B. 271
 Strack, H. L. 109, 110, 113, 127, 165, 168, 207
 Streeter, B. H. 149, 150, 226, 229, 230, 257, 263, 303, 307, 318, 319, 332, 343
 Suggs, M. J. 289
 Sundberg, A. C. Jr., 94, 113ff., 120, 346
 Swete, H. B. 14, 24, 34, 35, 37, 44, 55, 78, 81, 83, 119, 120, 174, 299

 Tarelli, C. C. 264
 Taylor, C. 282
 Taylor, V. 288
 Thackeray, H. St. J. 42, 56
 Thomas, K. J. 34
 Thyen, H. 103, 107, 127, 308
 Tischendorf, C. 160
 Torrance, T. F. 249
 Torrey, C. C. 120
 Turner, C. H. 10, 12
 Turpie, D. M. 23, 30, 34, 110

 Unnik, W. C. van 63, 86, 170, 304, 345, 348

 Van den Eynde, D. 304
 Venard, L. 34
 Vielhauer, P. 298, 300
 Vokes, F. E. 348
 Volkmar, G. 301, 302
 Vollmer, H. 84, 99
 Völter, D. 299

 Waitz, H. 301
 Wand, J. W. C. 238
 Weiss, J. 207
 Wendland, P. 308
 Werner, E. 8, 56, 72, 73, 74, 77, 80, 170, 206, 215, 251

- Westcott, B. F., 174, 217, 231, 249, 290, 305, 307, 340, 342, 346
Whittaker, M. 156
Wilcox, M. 34, 170, 261, 262
Wilkinson, J. R. 105, 149, 321
Williams, A. Lukyn 94
Williams, C. S. C. 331, 345, 346
Willoughby, H. R. 82
Wilson, R. McL. 296
Windisch, H. 275, 329
Wissowa, G. 290
Wood, J. D. 125
Woods, F. H. 34
Woolfs, B. L. 170
Woollcombe, K. J. 129
Wragg, J. 170
Wrede, W. 14, 22, 31, 103, 107, 111, 121, 126, 127, 128, 131, 186, 194, 213
Wright, L. W. 148, 163, 342
Young, F. W. 250, 256
Young, P. 4, 9
Zahn, T. 115, 118, 144, 147, 160, 209, 252, 275, 283, 299, 301, 319, 320, 321, 322, 324, 328, 329f., 333, 334, 336, 337, 345
Ziegler, A. W. 104, 128, 132, 199, 339
Ziegler, J. 62, 85, 172
Ziegler, K. 290
Zuntz, G. 180, 183, 185, 186, 215, 289, 321

INDEX OF REFERENCES

I. OLD TESTAMENT

(Italicized page numbers refer to principal discussion of reference.)

Genesis		16.33	22
1.9	22	17	129
1.26f.	27, 39	18.27	75
1.28	27, 40		
2.23	28, 39	Deuteronomy	
4.3ff.	22, 26, 38f.	4.34	27, 75
5.24	184	6	282
6ff.	245, 247	7.6	75, 236
6.8	184	9.12ff.	27, 40f., 191
12.1ff.	27, 39, 185, 263	9.13f.	28
12.3	94	9.27	191
13.14ff.	27, 39	14.2	75, 236
13.15	263	26.18	236
15.5f.	27, 28, 51, 55f., 218	28.66	221
15.10	190	32.8f.	26, 40
18	193	32.15	26, 64f., 123, 129, 208
18.27	28, 39f.		
19	193, 247	Joshua	
22	185	2	292
22.17	28, 55f.	2.3ff.	28, 56f.
26.4	28, 55f.	2.9ff.	28, 56f.
		2.13f.	28, 56f.
Exodus		2.18f.	28, 56f.
2.14	28, 37, 40, 175, 263	2.21	28
3.4	40, 41		
3.11	28, 56	Ruth	
4.10	28, 56	3.10	260
14.23	22		
19.5	236	1 Samuel (1 Reigns)	
23.22	236	2.10	59f., 99, 203
32.6	65, 208	13.14	27, 61, 259, 260, 263
32.32	28, 51f., 228		
33.1ff.	285	2 Samuel	
		7.8	196
Numbers			
11	74	2 Kings	
11.26ff.	87	4.33	176
12.7	22, 191		
16.22	190	1 Chronicles	
		29.15	72

2 Chronicles

31.14 75

Job

1.1 26, 52

4.5 25

4.16ff. 22, 26, 57f.

5.17ff. 22, 27, 41

11.2f. 27, 41

14.4f. 28, 52

15.15 26, 57f.

19.26 28, 52f.

31.1f. 26

33.12ff. 22

36.38 26

38.10 65

38.11 27, 65

Psalms (LXX)

2 122

2.7f. 27, 46, 180, 181, 263

2.8 180

3.6 58f.

4.5 26, 33, 274

7.3 45, 84

7.18 53

11.4ff. 27, 43

16.13 270

17.20 65

17.26f. 27, 46, 90

18.2ff. 28, 45

21.7ff. 27, 43, 122, 124, 175

22.4 58f.

23.1 28, 47

23.4 176

27.7 27, 58f.

30.19 28, 42

31.1f. 47, 124, 218

31.10 28, 45, 55, 122

33 23, 338

33.12ff. 28, 44, 55, 122

33.20 44

36.9 60

36.11 25

36.35ff. 27, 53

36.38 60

44.7 181

48.15 22

49

49.14f. 27, 47, 55, 176

49.16ff. 22, 26, 45f.

49.22 84

50 22, 23, 124, 261

50.3ff. 28, 43f.

50.12 176

50.19 28, 47, 55

61.5 27, 42

61.12 139

68.29 52

68.31f. 28, 53, 176

72.1 176

77.36f. 27, 42

85.9-15 265

87.11 58f.

88.21 27, 37, 61, 259, 260, 263

91.11 260

95 192

99.3 267

100.1 260

102.10f. 28, 70

103.4 26, 46, 84, 122, 180, 181, 182

108.8 257

109.1 27, 46, 122, 177, 181, 281

117.18 27, 47, 55

117.19f. 26, 46, 53, 130, 267

118.45 65

138 116

138.7ff. 26, 37, 66f., 80, 106

140.5 27, 47, 259

144.18 232

151.4 260

Proverbs

1.23ff. 22, 27, 48f.

1.29 48, 80, 85

2.21f. 26, 37, 60

3.4 25

3.12 28, 48, 55, 189

3.34 25, 27, 47f., 84, 167, 241, 242

6.23 65

7.3 22, 211

10.12 239

15.1 240

18.17 25

20.27	27, 37, 65f., 106	Jeremiah	
24.12	27, 61f., 93, 139, 270f.	3.19f.	28, 70
		9.22ff.	27, 37, 59f., 99
		9.23f.	203, 255, 338
		13.17	267
Isaiah			
1.16ff.	22, 27, 49		
1.18	28, 70		
3.5	22, 129, 208	Ezekiel	
4.3	228	14.14ff.	35
6.1-9.7	94	18.23	71
6.3	26, 37, 62f.	18.30f.	28, 70
13.22	23, 26, 37, 61	33.11ff.	28, 37, 54, 70, 71, 84, 85, 92
22.13	208	37.12	26, 63f., 124, 177
26.19	63	48.12	27, 75
26.20	26, 63f., 124, 176		
29.13	27, 37, 53f., 103, 172, 174,	Daniel	
	178	1.11	62
40.1-11	94	3.19ff.	62
40.10	27, 61f., 93, 270f.	3.25	62
40.26	225	4.30	225
41.8	184	6.16	62
42.16	243	7	94
44.28	260	7.10	26, 37, 62f.
52.5	25, 35, 219		
52.13-53.12	94	Hosea	
52.14	49	13.3	72
53.1ff.	27, 49ff., 122, 124		
53.3	85	Amos	
53.4	85	9.2f.	66
53.7f.	263		
54.8	61, 260	Habakkuk	
59.14	22	2.3	61
60.17	26, 37, 67, 106, 123, 228		
62.11	27, 62, 270f.	Zechariah	
64.3	27, 75, 204, 255	10.3	267
64.4	207	13.7	281
65.16	27, 204		
66.2	27, 49, 339	Malachi	
		3.1	23, 26, 37, 61
		3.1-6	94

II. APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHIA

Enoch (Ethiopian)		Judith	
38.2	157	8ff.	68
2 Esdras			
2.16	64	1 Maccabees	
14	113	2.51ff.	127

4 Maccabees		Tobit	
18.16	44	3.2	68
		3.5	266
		4.6	266
Sirach		13.6	266
2.11	68	13.7	68, 232
6.34	76	13.11	68, 232
10.22	204		
44-50	127, 178	Wisdom	
51.26	168	2.24	29, 68f.
		11.21	69, 224
Testament of Asher		12.10	68
6.2	215	12.12	29, 69, 224

III. NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew		16.27	139
3.15	278	18.3	281
5-7	137ff.	18.6	154, 158
5.3	141	18.7	157, 159
5.5	25	18.33	138
5.8	176	18.35	138
5.10	141	19.9	281
5.18	166	19.23	281
5.28	281	19.28	184
5.33	176	20.16	281
6.6	176	22.14	275, 281
6.12	138, 279	22.41ff.	281
6.14f.	138	22.43	193
7.1	141	22.44f.	46, 177
7.2	144	23.11	169
7.6	280	24	153, 280
7.13f.	167	24.32f.	165
7.21	166	24.35	166
9.13	32, 276, 281, 282	25.41	206
10.10	280	26.24	158
10.16	278	26.28	168
11.25	169	26.31	281
11.29f.	167, 168	26.41	273, 279
12.31	280	27.28	281
12.41	177	27.34	281
13	281	27.35	281
13.3	164	27.39	176
13.14f.	279	27.43	176
13.16f.	206		
15.4	30	Mark	
15.8	54, 172	1.1	178

2.17	276, 282	17.2	157
4.3	164	18.1	282
4.24	137	19.44	169
4.26ff.	73, 165	20.42f.	46, 177
7.6	54, 106, 172, 173	21.29f.	165
9.42	154	21.33	166
10.11	282	23.34f.	176
12.17	240	24.36ff.	300
12.30	282	24.38	206
12.36	46, 177, 193	24.39	279, 300
13.22	262		
13.28f.	73, 165	John	
13.31	166	1.29	267
14	153	3.21	266
14.21	158	6.51	267
14.38	273, 279	7.38	112
15.29	176	8.32ff.	266
		10.2-16	267
Luke		10.9	167, 267
1.14	169	10.26-28	267
1.46ff.	169	12.28	265
1.50	169	14.15	264
1.52f.	169	14.21	264
1.68ff.	169	14.23	264
1.71	169	15.3	266
1.72	169	15.10	264
1.75	169	17.1-6	265
2.9	169	17.3	265f.
2.29	169	17.17	266
6	137ff.	17.18	264
6.32	276, 278	19.24	281
6.35	139, 276	20.21	264
6.36	139, 145	21.16f.	267
6.37	144	21.25	297
6.38	140, 141, 144		
6.46	166	Acts	
8.5	164	1.2-8	256
9.35	169	1.8	257
10.20	190, 228	1.16	193
10.23	206	1.20	257
11.4	138	1.25	257
11.32	177	2	223
11.49	112	2.4	256, 257
12.14	40, 175	2.11	262
12.32	244, 267	2.17f.	257
13.24	167	2.47	262
16.17	166	3.13	262
17.1	157, 159	3.18	256

3.21	30	2.1ff.	138
3.26	262	2.4	139
4.25	193	2.6	139, 270
4.27	262	2.8	266
4.30	262	2.9	49
5.17	257	2.24	219
5.29	261	2.29	210
6.7	262	3-5	217
7.3	39, 263	4	222
7.5	263	4.3	51, 219, 285
7.27	40, 175, 263	4.10f.	285
7.35	40, 263	4.7ff.	47, 218
8.1	256	4.8	47
8.32f.	263	4.9	218
11.21	262	5.1	217
12.12-17	258	5.5	223
12.17	257	5.12	68
13.22	27, 61, 259ff., 263	6.1	216, 217
13.33	46, 180, 263	6.12f.	217
13.35	31	6.19	217
13.45	257	8.35	49
14.23	256	9.4f.	216
15.9	266	9.5	216
15.14	75	9.33	207
15.20	139	10.6ff.	207
15.28	139	11.16	92
17.26	261, 262	11.33	218, 225
20	244	11.36	197, 217
20.28f.	262, 267	12.4f.	197, 217
20.29f.	262	12.5	199
20.35	142, 149, 151, 258f., 273, 306, 307, 338	12.6	245
23.1	226, 233, 245, 262	12.9	76, 89
26.7	262	12.10	225, 245
26.18	230, 243, 262	12.16	225, 245
27.15	262	12.19	30
28.35	193	13.1	220
		13.12f.	217
		14.1	219
Romans		14.11	207
1.2	30	15.1	219
1.4	220	15.2	224
1.12	183	15.10ff.	31
1.18	266	16.5	202
1.20	219	16.19	227
1.21	217, 225		
1.28	216	1 Corinthians	
1.29ff.	214ff., 291, 309	1.2	315
1.30	234	1.10ff.	6, 195

1.11	196	12.7	200
1.12	196	12.8ff.	199
1.18	283	12.12-27	197
1.19	229	12.12f.	223
1.20	283	12.17	198
1.31	60, 100, 203, 204, 210, 212	12.20ff.	197
2	196, 339	12.21	198
2.7	206	12.24	198
2.9	27, 76, 101, 112, 117, 204ff., 254	12.25f.	198, 199
2.10	197, 218, 225	12.26	198
3.3ff.	6	12.27	199
3.4	196	12.28ff.	202
3.19	24	12.29	199
3.22	196	13	268, 291
4.4	283	13.1	200
4.5	212	13.3	200, 208
4.7	209, 212	13.4	139
4.10	208	13.4ff.	200
4.14	197	13.5	228
4.15	196	13.6	266
5.11	322	13.10	200
6.2	274, 284	13.13	200, 269
6.9	284	14.21	30
6.15	199, 217	14.25	274
6.16	30	14.34	225
6.17	89	14.37	339
7.7	245	15.20	201
7.10ff.	338	15.23	201
7.14	89	15.32	65, 208
7.25	338	15.36ff.	164, 201
7.39f.	285	15.37	210
8.6	197, 217, 223	16.1	315
9.5	257	16.11	202
9.14	338	16.15	202
9.19	209	16.17	202, 210, 228
9.24	208, 227	16.22	284
10.6	126	2 Corinthians	
10.7	65, 208	1.1	315
10.11	121, 126	3.3	211
10.16	284	3.18	211
10.21	284	5.3	210
10.24	209	5.10	139
10.33	209	6.16	30
11	168	6.17	30
11.3	138	6.18	196
12	217	7.8	322
12.4	198	7.11	199

- | | | | |
|-----------|----------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| 8.1 | 315 | 4.18 | 217, 225 |
| 8.9 | 227 | 4.22ff. | 285 |
| 9.8 | 211 | 4.24 | 266 |
| 9.12 | 202, 210 | 4.25 | 217 |
| 10-12 | 212 | 4.26 | 25, 33, 274, 284 |
| 10.1 | 320 | 4.30 | 285 |
| 10.11 | 320 | 4.32-5.1 | 224 |
| 10.12 | 212 | 5.2 | 222 |
| 10.13f. | 212 | 5.9 | 266 |
| 10.17 | 203, 210 | 5.14 | 112 |
| 10.18 | 210, 339 | 5.21 | 224, 225, 245 |
| 11.9 | 202 | 5.22ff. | 225, 229 |
| 11.23ff. | 210 | 5.23 | 224 |
| 11.25 | 210 | 5.30ff. | 197, 217 |
| 11.32f. | 210 | 6.8 | 139 |
| 12.9 | 212 | 6.10 | 69, 225 |
| 12.20 | 212 | 6.14 | 266 |
| 13.11 | 212 | Philippians | |
| Galatians | | 1.1 | 67, 228 |
| 1.2 | 315 | 1.10 | 227 |
| 1.11-17 | 339 | 1.19 | 24 |
| 2.9 | 221 | 1.27 | 225, 226, 227, 320 |
| 2.20 | 221 | 1.30 | 227 |
| 3 | 222 | 2.3 | 227 |
| 3.1 | 221 | 2.6ff. | 226 |
| 3.9 | 222 | 2.15 | 227 |
| 3.10ff. | 221 | 2.21 | 228 |
| 3.14 | 222 | 2.30 | 202, 228 |
| 5.19f. | 222 | 3.1 | 320 |
| 5.21 | 217 | 3.14 | 208, 227 |
| 6.1 | 221 | 3.20 | 225, 226 |
| 6.7 | 274 | 4.3 | 3, 227, 228 |
| 6.16 | 222 | 4.5 | 227 |
| Ephesians | | 4.15 | 178, 196, 226, 273, 330 |
| 1.4 | 224, 225 | Colossians | |
| 1.6 | 224 | 1.9 | 229, 230 |
| 1.17 | 224 | 1.10 | 231 |
| 1.18 | 223, 224 | 1.11 | 230 |
| 1.19 | 69, 225 | 1.12f. | 229, 243, 262 |
| 2.8 | 274, 284 | 1.24 | 202 |
| 2.10 | 285 | 2.1 | 227, 229 |
| 2.12 | 225 | 3.14 | 229, 269 |
| 3.12 | 225 | 3.18 | 229 |
| 3.18f. | 218, 225 | 4.16 | 315, 317, 322 |
| 4.3ff. | 285 | 1 Thessalonians | |
| 4.4-7 | 223 | 1.5 | 237 |

2.10 237
2.13 339
4.15 338
4.16 306
5.23 237
5.27 315

2 Thessalonians
3.10 285

1 Timothy
1.5 233, 245, 262
1.16 232
1.17 232
1.18 233
1.19 233, 245, 262
2.1f. 232
2.2 233
2.3 232
2.6 233
2.7 232, 233, 234
2.8 232
2.9f. 233
3.1-13 228
3.3 227
3.4 233
3.9 234
3.10 232
5.4 232
5.8 341
5.17 233
5.18 90
5.21 232
5.24f. 233
6.7 274
6.8 233
6.12 227
6.15 233

2 Timothy
1.3 234
1.6 234
1.11 233
2.2 233
2.3f. 233
2.5 227, 234
2.12 234
2.21 211

2.22 234
2.31 234
3.2 234
3.15 105, 110, 234
3.16 21, 110, 234
3.17 211
4.6 234
4.7 227
4.14 139

Titus
1.2 234
1.3 233
1.5 235
2.4f. 234
2.5 229, 235
2.7 233
2.10 236
2.14 236
3.1 211, 234, 235
3.2 227
3.5 184, 236

Philemon
2 317

Hebrews
1 122, 181
1.2 184
1.3f. 46, 179f., 184, 190, 291
1.4 289
1.5 31, 46, 180, 192
1.7 46, 180, 192
1.8 181, 191
1.13 177, 181
1.14 192
2.3 192
2.6 31, 193
2.11 194
2.13 31
2.17 182
2.18f. 182
3.1 192, 194
3.2 22, 191
3.5 22, 191
3.7 30, 31, 193
3.8 192
3.14 192, 194

3.15	192	11.7	184, 245, 247
4.2	192, 194	11.8f.	185
4.4	31, 193	11.10	187
4.12	190	11.11	185, 187
4.14	183	11.13	244
4.15	182	11.17	185
5.3	182	11.27	187
5.5	180	11.31	185, 186, 251
5.6	31	11.32	187
5.7-10	194	11.34	187
5.12	194	11.35	187
6.4f.	183, 192	11.37	186, 188
6.9	182	11.39	187, 192
6.15	185	12	194
6.18	190, 192, 234	12.1f.	188, 189, 227, 255
7.14	192	12.2	183, 188, 227
7.26	183	12.6	28, 48, 189
8.3	182	12.7f.	189
8.5	30	12.9	190
9.4	192	12.10	189
9.8	181, 193	12.11	189
9.9	194	12.14	194
9.14	183, 194	12.17	190
9.19	192	12.22	194
10.2	194	12.23	190, 228
10.5	182	12.28	190
10.7	185	13.1	193
10.8	182	13.2	193
10.10	182	13.6	182
10.14	182	13.7	193
10.15	30, 31, 193	13.15	184, 194
10.18	182	13.16	194
10.19ff.	183	13.17	193
10.20	182, 194	13.18	194
10.22	194	13.20	267
10.23	187, 192	13.21	192
10.25	194		
10.30	30, 31	James	
10.32	227	1.5ff.	252
10.36	191	1.8	73, 88, 252, 253
10.37	61	1.9f.	255
11	127, 178, 184, 194, 251	1.12	254, 255
11.2	192	1.15	255
11.3	194	1.17ff.	255
11.4	39, 192	1.21	255
11.5-8	184	1.22	167
11.5	184, 192	1.25	255
11.6	200	2	127

2.13	138	2 Peter	
2.14ff.	167	1.4	247
2.15f.	251	1.16	248
2.21ff.	185, 222, 250	1.17	248
2.23	219	1.19	248
2.25f.	186, 250, 251	1.21	110
3.13	251	2	127
3.16	254	2.1	248
3.17	227	2.2	244, 247
4.1	254	2.5f.	247
4.2	254	2.13	248
4.5	112	3.1	227
4.6	27, 48, 167, 241, 252	3.2	341
4.8	88, 235	3.4	73, 248
4.14	72, 253	3.5ff.	246
4.16	252	3.9	169
1 Peter		3.14	247
1.1	244	3.15f.	320, 341
1.2	244, 248	3.16	341
1.8	286	1 John	
1.12	255	1.6	266
1.15f.	242, 243	1.7	269
1.17	139, 244	1.9	269
1.18f.	239, 269	2.2	269
1.19	169	2.5	268
2.1	242, 255	3.2	270
2.9	122, 183, 230, 243, 244, 245,	4.7-21	268
	262	4.9	268
2.11	244	4.12	268
2.12	244, 286	4.14	269
2.13f.	245	4.16	268
2.17	244	4.18	200, 268
2.18	227	5.2	264
2.21	244	Jude	
2.25	245	2	244
3.1ff.	225, 233	14ff.	111
3.2	245	25	248
3.16	233, 245, 262	Revelation	
3.21	233, 262	2.18	46, 180
4.3	244	2.23	139
4.8	25, 239ff, 252, 268	2.26	180
4.10	245	3.5	228
4.19	244	5.11	63
5.2f.	244, 267	15.3	232
5.5	27, 48, 225, 241, 242, 243,	22.11	89
	245, 252	22.12	62, 93, 270ff.
5.9	244		
5.13	246		

IV. CLEMENT OF ROME

(Italicized page numbers refer to principal discussion of reference.)

1.1	4, 6, 196, 244	8.3	28, 69ff., 86, 90, 92, 99, 118, 273
1.2	130, 193, 227, 248	8.4	27, 29, 49, 92, 99
1.3	193, 222, 225, 229, 233, 234 235, 244	8.5	123, 196
2.1	142, 221, 225, 233, 258, 307	9-12	184, 193, 194
2.2	144, 257	9.1	248
2.3	196, 232	9.2	248
2.4	190, 227, 229, 244	9.3	184
2.5	227	9.4	184, 245, 247
2.7	211, 234, 235, 244	9.20-10.3	184
2.8	22, 211, 225, 226	10.1f.	184, 250
3.1	26, 30, 64f., 123, 129, 208	10.3	27, 29, 39, 263
3.1ff.	221	10.4f.	27, 29, 39, 110, 263
3.2	222, 253	10.6	27, 51, 55, 218
3.3	22, 129, 208	10.7	193, 250
3.4	22, 29, 68f., 86, 112, 117, 129, 226	11.1	192, 193, 247
4	22	11.2	253
4-6	257	12.1ff.	29, 124, 147, 185, 193, 250, 292
4.1ff.	26, 38f.	12.3	193
4.7	222	12.4ff.	28, 56f.
4.10	28, 29, 37, 40, 175, 187, 263	12.5	80
5.1	5, 126, 208, 227, 254	12.7	124, 130, 192
5.2f.	221, 222, 340	13.1f.	26, 27, 29, 31, 37, 59f., 99, 100, 110, 189, 193, 203, 204, 210, 227, 255, 258, 259, 272
5.3f.	3, 246	13.2	121, 135ff., 178, 278, 279, 292, 295, 306, 307, 332, 338
5.4	257, 258	13.4	27, 29, 30, 49, 100, 110
5.5f.	208, 210, 227	14.1	254, 261
5.6	233, 234	14.3	224
5.7	126, 244	14.4	26, 37, 60, 100
6.1	126	14.5	27, 53, 100
6.3	28, 29, 39	14.5ff.	172
6.4	222	15	123
7.1	189, 197, 227	15.2-6	100
7.2ff.	239	15.2	27, 29, 37, 53f., 106, 171, 278
7.3	189, 232	15.3	27, 42
7.4	168, 189, 269	15.4	27, 42, 98
7.5	68, 169, 177, 190	15.5f.	27, 28, 42f., 44, 98, 100
7.6ff.	54, 245, 247	16.1	43, 124, 244, 262
7.7	177, 225	16.2ff.	27, 29, 31, 49ff., 110, 191, 193, 226, 234
8	124		
8.1	193		
8.2	28, 29, 37, 54, 79, 84, 85, 92, 99, 110		

16.3	85	27.1	187
16.7f.	263	27.2	190, 234
16.15	27, 29, 43, 122, 175	27.3	234
16.17	126, 167, 227, 244	27.4	190, 246
17.1	122, 186, 192, 254	27.5	29, 69, 86, 112, 117, 166, 224
17.2	28, 29, 39, 169, 192	27.7	28, 45
17.3	26, 29, 52, 254	28.3	26, 29, 30, 37, 66f., 80, 100, 106, 116, 117
17.4	28, 29, 52	29	101
17.5	22, 28, 29, 56, 73, 191	29.1	122, 194, 227, 232, 245
17.6	28, 72f., 87, 88, 117, 118, 253, 273	29.2	26, 40f.
18	22	29.3	27, 29, 74f., 86, 91, 117, 118, 124, 242
18.1	27, 29, 37, 61, 110, 192, 259ff., 263	30.1	122, 194, 234, 242, 243
18.2ff.	28, 29, 43f.	30.2	27, 47f., 84, 241, 242, 243, 252
18.7	43	30.3	166, 251
18.10	176	30.4f.	27, 41
19.1	111, 188, 192	30.6	210, 219
19.2f.	187, 248, 255	30.8	227
20.4	166, 233	31.1	194, 222
20.6	22	31.2	222, 249, 266
20.7	27, 29, 65	32.1	262
20.10	192, 227, 233	32.2	28, 29, 55f., 216
20.11	187, 192	32.3f.	217, 236, 249
20.12	248	32.4	169, 196, 216, 217, 229, 249
21.1	192, 226	33	249
21.2	27, 29, 37, 65f., 106	33.1	211, 216, 235, 244, 262
21.3	274	33.2ff.	170
21.5	252	33.4	192
21.6	267, 269	33.5	27, 29, 39f., 110
21.7	227, 232	33.6	27, 29, 40
21.9	190	33.7	233
22.1ff.	28, 29, 44, 55, 100, 121, 193, 338	33.8	126, 244
22.8	28, 44, 45, 98	34.1ff.	63, 262
23	100	34.2	197, 217, 244
23.1f.	252	34.3	27, 30, 61f., 93, 101, 124, 270f.
23.3f.	28, 29, 33, 73f., 87, 89, 112, 118, 248, 252, 253, 273, 276	34.4	211, 235
23.4	165	34.5ff.	11, 170, 194
23.5	23, 26, 37, 61	34.6	26, 37, 62f., 77, 98, 101
24.1	201	34.7	192, 194, 206
24.5	164, 171, 178, 201, 210, 278	34.7-35.4	255
25.1ff.	89	34.8	27, 75f., 86, 101, 117, 204ff., 254
26	100	35	22, 349
26.1	225, 236, 262	35.2f.	121, 225, 269
26.2	11, 27, 29, 58f., 106, 124		
26.3	28, 29, 52f.		

- | | | | |
|---------|--|---------|--|
| 35.4f. | 191, 227, 247, 254 | 46.1 | 126 |
| 35.5f. | 193, 214ff., 266, 291, 309 | 46.2 | 28, 76f., 87, 89, 112, 118, 273 |
| 35.7ff. | 26, 45f. | 46.3 | 27, 29, 46, 92 |
| 35.11 | 84 | 46.5 | 254 |
| 35.12 | 194 | 46.6 | 223 |
| 36 | 193, 349 | 46.7f. | 142, 199, 217, 254, 258, 273 |
| 36.1f. | 121, 182, 184, 194 | 46.8 | 121, 135, 153ff., 178, 259, 278, 282, 292, 307, 332, 338 |
| 36.2 | 130, 179f., 182, 210, 217, 223, 225, 243, 289, 291 | 46.9 | 6, 155 |
| 36.3ff. | 26, 46, 84, 122 | 47 | 349 |
| 36.4 | 27, 29, 46, 110, 180, 263 | 47.1f. | 178, 195, 209, 213, 226, 273, 320, 323f., 329, 340 |
| 36.5 | 27, 29, 46, 177, 181 | 47.2 | 332 |
| 37.1f. | 233, 262 | 47.3ff. | 273, 341 |
| 37.2f. | 193 | 47.4 | 340 |
| 37.3 | 199, 201 | 47.5 | 193 |
| 37.4 | 192 | 47.6 | 5, 6 |
| 37.5 | 197, 217 | 47.7 | 6, 219 |
| 38.1 | 197, 198, 217, 224, 245 | 48.1 | 193 |
| 38.2 | 202, 209, 210, 212, 219, 228, 251 | 48.2f. | 26, 46, 53, 130 |
| 38.3ff. | 170 | 48.4 | 167, 169, 267 |
| 39 | 22 | 48.5 | 130, 199 |
| 39.3ff. | 26, 57f., 77 | 48.6 | 169, 200, 209, 228 |
| 40.1 | 130, 197, 218, 225, 255 | 49 | 349 |
| 40.4 | 262 | 49.1 | 264 |
| 41.1 | 201, 202, 212, 233, 245, 262 | 49.2 | 229 |
| 41.4 | 130 | 49.3 | 244, 262 |
| 42 | 231 | 49.5 | 25, 200, 239f., 252, 268, 291 |
| 42.1f. | 192, 264, 339 | 49.6 | 222, 267, 268 |
| 42.2 | 11, 121 | 50.1 | 200 |
| 42.3f. | 237, 256 | 50.2 | 232 |
| 42.4 | 202, 227, 232, 235 | 50.3 | 169, 244, 268 |
| 42.5 | 26, 29, 37, 67, 106, 123, 228 | 50.4 | 26, 63f., 98, 101, 124, 177 |
| 43 | 129, 192 | 50.6 | 26, 47, 101, 124, 218 |
| 43.1 | 22, 110, 117, 191 | 50.7 | 218 |
| 43.6 | 265 | 51.3 | 192, 233, 269 |
| 44 | 231 | 51.4 | 22 |
| 44.1f. | 262, 340 | 51.5 | 22, 217 |
| 44.2 | 233 | 52 | 101 |
| 44.3 | 5, 244, 262 | 52.1 | 261 |
| 44.4 | 237 | 52.2 | 28, 29, 53 |
| 44.5 | 5, 234 | 52.3 | 27, 28, 47, 55, 176 |
| 44.6 | 6, 237 | 52.4 | 47 |
| 45.2 | 105, 110, 234 | 53.1 | 105, 111, 234, 255 |
| 45.6f. | 62 | 53.2f. | 27, 29, 40, 110 |
| 45.7 | 234 | 53.3 | 28 |
| 45.8 | 190, 228 | 53.4 | 28, 29, 51f. |

53.5	191	59.1	341
54.2	244, 262, 267	59.2	224, 229, 243, 261, 262
54.3	28, 47	59.3	68, 169, 223, 245, 248, 261, 265
55.1	126	59.4	267
55.2	208	60	22
55.3ff.	187, 212	60.1	68, 194, 219
55.4f.	68, 112	60.2	266
55.6	187, 262	60.3	169
56	22, 101	60.4	193, 196, 232, 266
56.1	221, 227	61.1f.	220, 232, 245, 248
56.2	189	61.2	68, 232
56.3	27, 29, 30, 47, 55, 98, 110	61.3	169, 181, 245
56.4	28, 48, 98, 189	62.1f.	6
56.5	27, 47, 98, 259	62.2	196, 227, 266
56.6ff.	27, 41	62.3	105, 111
56.16	189	63.1	126, 188, 227, 248
57	22	63.2	169, 341
57.1	243	63.3	5
57.2	189, 244, 255, 262, 267	64	248
57.3ff.	27, 29, 30, 48f., 77, 110, 117	64.1	169, 181, 190, 220, 225, 236
57.5	80, 85	65.1	202
58.2	227, 262	65.2	248
59	22		
59-61	169ff.		
59.1-3	223		

V. OTHER APOSTOLIC FATHERS

Barnabas		9.1	32
2.10	31, 32	9.2	32
4.3	112, 118, 275	11.9	32, 112, 275
4.8	41	12.1	112, 275
4.14	275, 281, 341	12.2	32
5.5	40	12.10	281
5.9	281, 300, 332	13.7	285
5.12	31, 281	14.3	41
6.6	281	15.1	32
6.8	285	16.2	31
6.10	32	16.5	112, 118, 275
6.11ff.	285	18-21	281
6.13	31, 32, 275	19.7	257
6.14	32	21.3	271
6.16	31		
7.3	281	2 Clement	
7.4	32	2.4	275, 276, 282, 341
7.9	281	2.5	282
8.3	332	2.7	282

3.2	276	Hermas	
3.4	282	<i>Visions</i>	
3.5	32, 54, 173	II, 2, 4	88
4.2	276	II, 2, 7	88
4.5	276, 297, 301	II, 3, 4	74, 87, 112, 118, 275
5.1	244	II, 4, 3	1
5.2ff.	276, 282, 297, 301	III, 2ff.	88
6.1f.	276, 282	III, 4, 3	74
6.8	32, 35	III, 6, 2	76, 89
8.5	276, 282, 297, 332	III, 6, 5	281
8.6	244	IV, 1f.	88
10.2	244	IV, 2, 6	156, 282
11.2ff.	33, 74, 87, 112, 118, 166, 248, 252, 253, 276	<i>Mandates</i>	
11.7	205	IV, 1, 1	281
12.2	282, 300f.	IV, 1, 6	281
13.2	32	IV, 6, 1f.	285
13.4	276, 282	IX	74, 88
14.2	341	IX, 8	282
14.3	244	X	88
15.3	32	X, 2, 1ff.	285
16.4	25, 240	<i>Similitudes</i>	
17.3	142	III, 3	281
17.4	32	IV, 2	281
		V, 2	281
		V, 5, 2	281
		V, 6, 6	226
		VIII, 7f.	88
		VIII, 8, 1	76, 89
		IX, 11, 1ff.	167
		IX, 13, 5	223, 285
		IX, 18, 4	223
		IX, 20, 1	281
		IX, 20, 2	76, 89, 281
		IX, 27, 3	257
		IX, 29, 1ff.	281
		Ignatius	
		<i>Ephesians</i>	
		5.3	25, 33, 241
		12.2	320
		14.2	279
		17.1	279
		18.1	283
		<i>Magnesians</i>	
		5.1	257
Didache			
1-6	281, 284		
1	281		
1.1	167		
1.2	139, 280		
1.3b-2.1	280, 284		
1.6	33, 274		
3.7	25, 280		
5.2	76		
7.1	280		
8.2	274, 280, 332, 333		
9.2	280, 284		
9.5	274, 275, 280		
10.6	284		
11.3	332		
11.7	280		
12.3	285		
13.1	280		
14.3	33, 274		
15.3f.	332		
16	280		
16.7	33, 274		

IV, 3, 3 240
 IV, 32, 2 53, 140, 172
 IV, 32, 4 42, 54, 172
 IV, 32, 5 42
 IV, 33, 1 42
 IV, 105-119 140
 IV, 105, 1 52, 140
 IV, 105, 4 185, 186, 187
 IV, 106, 4 56, 72
 IV, 107, 1 61, 260
 IV, 107, 2ff. 43
 IV, 109, 1f. 44, 98
 IV, 109, 3 44
 IV, 110, 1 45
 IV, 110, 2 183, 217, 243
 IV, 111, 1 1
 IV, 111, 3 200
 IV, 113, 2 53
 IV, 113, 3 47, 176
 IV, 118, 2 41
 IV, 118, 3 51
 IV, 118, 4f. 187
 IV, 135, 2 67
 IV, 135, 3 62, 271
 V, 25, 5 206
 V, 52, 3f. 46, 76
 V, 80, 1 140
 VI, 64, 2 46
 VI, 64, 3 140
 VI, 65, 3 1, 199
 VII, 94, 2 91

Clementine Homilies

II, 13 205
 XII, 29, 1 159

Didascalia Apostolorum

II, 3 240
 VII 143
 IX 144
 X 143

Epiphanius

Haer.

9ff. 327
 23, 1, 5 40
 27, 6 3

29, 7, 2ff. 117
 30, 3, 7 298
 30, 30 91
 42 315
 46, 1 298
 64 90, 205

Eusebius

Hist. Eccles.

II, 23, 24f. 336
 II, 23, 25 249
 III, 3 299
 III, 15 3, 4
 III, 16 8
 III, 21 2
 III, 24, 7ff. 333
 III, 25 299
 III, 25, 5 298
 III, 27 298
 III, 29, 17 298
 III, 34, 3, 4
 III, 36, 11 299
 III, 38, 1 179
 III, 38, 3 179
 III, 39, 3 304
 III, 39, 4 304, 340
 III, 39, 14ff. 333
 III, 39, 16 145, 294
 IV, 14, 9 286
 IV, 22, 1 1
 IV, 22, 8 298
 IV, 22, 9 29, 117
 IV, 23, 11 1
 V, 20, 6f. 305
 VI, 12 299
 VI, 14, 7ff. 333
 VI, 25, 14 179

Praep. Ev.

13, 12

Irenaeus

Adv. haer.

III, 3, 3 1, 2
 III, 11, 8 333
 IV, 20 130
 IV, 26, 5 67, 228

Comm. in Joann.

6.36 3

Jerome

Comm. on Eph.

5.4 298

Comm. on Is.

XVIII, pref. 299

64.4 206

Comm. on Mt.

12.13 298

Comm. on Micah

7.6 298

Contra Pelag.

III, 2 300

De vir. ill.

2 298, 299

3 298

15 2, 179

16 299, 300

Prol. to Gen. Ep.

57.9 207

Justin Martyr

Apology I

15.13 139

26 95

66.3 332

Dialogue

96.3 139

100.1 332

111 130

Origen

Comm. on Mt.

10.17 299

18.7 159

27.9 206

27.28 130

De princ. praef.

8 299

in Jerem. Hom.

XVIII, 15 205

in Joh. Hom.

II, 12 298

in Luc. Hom.

I, 1 299

Tertullian

Adv. Marc.

IV, 5 327, 328

IV, 35 157

V 312, 327

V, 21 324

De carne Christi

23 91

De resurr.

26 205